

THE LIBERATOR.

VOL. VI. OUR COUNTRY IS THE WORLD--OUR COUNTRYMEN ARE ALL MANKIND. NO. 23.

BOSTON, MASSACHUSETTS.] [SATURDAY, JUNE 4, 1836.

THE LIBERATOR
IS PUBLISHED WEEKLY, AT
NO. 46, WASHINGTON-STREET, BY
ISAAC KNAPP.

WM. LLOYD GARRISON, EDITOR.

REFUGE OF OPPRESSION.

SLAVERY IN THE DISTRICT OF COLUMBIA.

CONGRESS OF THE UNITED STATES.

IN THE HOUSE OF REPRESENTATIVES.

February 8, 1836.

Resolved, That all the memorials which have been offered, or may hereafter be presented to this House, praying for the abolition of slavery in the district of Columbia; and, also, the resolutions offered by an honorable member from Maine, (Mr. Jarvis,) with the amendment thereto proposed by an honorable member from Virginia (Mr. Wise;) together with every other paper or proposition that may be submitted in relation to the subject, be referred to a select committee, with instructions to report:

That Congress possesses no constitutional authority to interfere, in any way, with the institution of slavery in any of the states of this confederacy; and

That, in the opinion of this House, Congress ought not to interfere, in any way, with slavery in the District of Columbia, because it would be a violation of public faith, unwise, impolitic, and dangerous to the Union. Assigning such reasons for those conclusions as, in the judgment of the committee, may be best calculated to enlighten the public mind, to allay excitement, to repress agitation, to secure and maintain the just rights of the slaveholding states, and of the people of this District, and to restore harmony and tranquillity among the various sections of this Union.

Mr. PINCKNEY of South Carolina,
Mr. HAMER of Ohio,
Mr. PIERCE of New Hampshire,
Mr. HARDIN of Kentucky,
Mr. JARVIS of Maine,
Mr. OWENS of Georgia,
Mr. MUHLENBERG of Pennsylvania,
Mr. DROMGOOLE of Virginia, and
Mr. TURRILL, of New York,

were appointed a committee in pursuance of the resolution.

Attest: W. S. FRANKLIN, *Clerk*.

REPORT OF MR. PINCKNEY.

The select committee, appointed under the following resolution of the House of Representatives of the United States, of the 8th of February, 1836, viz: "*Resolved*, That all the memorials which have been offered, or may hereafter be presented to this House, praying for the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia; and also the resolutions offered by an honorable member from Maine, (Mr. Jarvis,) with the amendment thereto proposed by an honorable member from Virginia (Mr. Wise;) together with every other paper or proposition that may be submitted in relation to this subject, be referred to a select committee, with instructions to report: That Congress possesses no constitutional authority to interfere, in any way, with the institution of slavery in any of the states of this confederacy; and that in the opinion of this House, Congress ought not to interfere in any way with slavery in the District of Columbia, because it would be a violation of the public faith, unwise, impolitic, and dangerous to the Union: assigning such reasons for these conclusions as, in the judgment of the committee, may be best calculated to enlighten the public mind, to allay excitement, to repress agitation, to secure and maintain the just rights of the slaveholding states, and of the people of this district, and to restore harmony and tranquillity amongst the various sections of this Union;" respectfully submit the following report, in which, they have unanimously concurred:

The subject referred is one of grave import. Your committee approach it with a deep sense of its magnitude and absorbing interest. They have long considered the movements in relation to this matter as fraught with incalculable evils, not only to the slave-holding states, but to every portion of our common country. They rejoice, therefore, that the great body of the people of the non-slaveholding states have come forward, as they have done, in the true spirit of American patriotism, to sustain their constitutional obligations to their southern brethren, and to arrest the disturbance of the public peace. They rejoice particularly, that the Federal Legislature, acting under a deep sense of its responsibility to the nation, has also interposed its warning voice, and given a solemn expression of its judgment upon this exciting subject; and they feel assured, that as the Representatives have responded to the people, so the people will firmly and patriotically sustain the position now taken by their Representatives.

As moderation is essential to the discovery of truth, your committee will carefully abstain from every thing that may cause offence, or inflame excitement, in any section of the Union. But while they would make every allowance for the motives of individuals, where the objects contemplated are utterly destructive to society, they cannot too strongly express their condemnation of the conduct of the abolitionists, and their utter abhorrence of the consequences to which, if persisted in, it must inevitably lead. They feel assured that no man or set of men, will be permitted to put the country and the Government at defiance, by persevering in machinations which threaten to bring the citizens of the different states into collision, and to overthrow the whole system of civil society itself, in the slaveholding portions of the Union. Your committee believe that the strength of the agitators has been greatly exaggerated, by themselves and others; but whether their number be small or great, there can be no doubt that they have done, and are doing, incalculable evil; and every true patriot must be aware that a crisis has now arrived in the political condition of the country, in which neutrality would be criminal, and in which he must determine between the suppression of abolition, and the destruction of the Union, and take his stand accordingly, for or against his country.

Your committee have learned with surprise, that the reference of this subject has caused dissatisfaction in certain portions of the south. While they deeply regret this circumstance, they beg leave to remark, that it is not only abundantly justified by precedent, but in entire accordance with the established usage and invariable policy, in relation to matters of this character; memorials praying for the abolition of slavery in the states, or in the District of Columbia, having always been either referred or laid upon the table. On the present occasion, the subject was referred for the express purpose of having a report 'calculated to sustain the just rights of the slave-holding states, and of the people of this District and by allaying excitement, and repressing agitation; to insure the future repose and permanent tranquillity of the country. The House was unwilling, on the one side, to invade what was believed to be the right of petition, [a right equally dear to every portion of our people, and which, it is thought, could not have been denied in this instance, without establishing a precedent at least as hazardous to the south, as to any other section of the Union;] and it was desirous, on the other, to accomplish for the south, what could not have been effected by refusing to receive the memorials, the union of an overwhelming majority, in a solemn and determined stand against the views and objects of the applicants. Whilst the denial of the rights of petition could have produced none other than the most mischievous effects, your committee are thoroughly satisfied that the course adopted by the House will produce a state of public opinion and feeling in the nonslave-holding states, eminently favorable to the constitutional rights and interests of the slaveholding sections of the Union

The resolutions under which your committee were appointed, naturally divides itself into several branches or propositions, each of which shall be considered in its order.

They are instructed to report, in the first place—

That Congress possesses no constitutional authority to interfere in any way with the institution of slavery, in any of the states of this confederacy

Your committee will merely allude to this proposition, in obedience to the express direction given them by the House, and not for the purpose of entering into any argument respecting it. Unquestionably, if there is any political or constitutional principle, which the people of the United States consider as settled beyond all possible dispute or controversy, it is that the institution of slavery, as it exists in the states of this confederacy, is municipal, not national, and that it belongs exclusively to the state, and can only be affected by state legislation. The power to regulate or act upon it, is one of the reserved powers of the states; a power which was not only not given, nor ever intended to be given, by the framers of the constitution, to the general government, but which the states expressly and carefully guarded and retained to themselves by that amendment of that instrument, (article 10) in which it is declared, that 'all powers not delegated by the constitution to the United States, nor prohibited by it to the states, are reserved to the states respectively, or to the people.' The subject of slavery in the states, then, is not an open question or matter of debate. The fact that Congress possesses no authority whatever to legislate respecting it, is one that can neither be strengthened by argument nor made clearer by discussion. And your committee consider it most fortunate for the peace of the country, that it is so. He is indeed but little acquainted with the human heart, and has derived but little advantages from the lessons of history, who can imagine for a moment, if he knows any thing of the general character, or considers the political and physical strength of the people of the south, that even if the power of legislation on this subject had been expressly conferred on Congress by the constitution, it could be exercised against the consent of the states interested, without the certainty of civil war, and the probable dissolution of the Union. The declaration, however, which the House has so solemnly and decisively made upon this point, cannot fail, as your committee believe, to produce the most beneficial results. As the abolitionists care little for emancipation in the District, except as the precursor of a far more extended and general scheme, the presumption is that having now no possible hope of Governmental interference with the States, and seeing the more than probable consequences of the exercise of such a power, if it were possessed, they will discontinue their machinations in relation to the District; a consummation devoutly to be wished by every patriot, in every section of the Union. But be the issue what it may, the House of Representatives has done its duty by placing this solemn declaration upon record. It is not only peculiarly proper in itself, considering the present state of the abolition question, but, if any justification were necessary, it is amply justified by precedent. In 1790, (and from that period to the present, the abolitionists have steadily aimed at general emancipation) several petitions, praying for the abolition of slavery in the states, having been presented and referred, the House finally adopted a resolution, amongst others, in which it announced to the petitioners, and to the country, "that Congress has no authority to interfere in the emancipation of slaves, or in the treatment of them, in any of the states, it remaining with the several states alone to provide any regulations therein, which humanity or policy may require." Upon the whole, your committee consider the instruction given them by the House on this point, rather as a decisive expression of great fundamental principle of a constitutional law, than as a call upon them to sustain a questionable position. They are aware that some members voted against the instruction upon this point, under the impression that, whilst the principle asserted is unquestionable in itself, its assertion by the House, in this form, might seem to imply doubt, and to countenance the idea that it is really debateable. In this view, the members who thus voted, may be joined perhaps by many intelligent and worthy citizens of the slave holding states, but your committee cannot believe that the assertion in any form, by the House of Representatives, of a principle so important, and at the same time of so strong a local bearing, and particularly by a vote so dearly approaching unanimity as is recorded on its journal in favor of this instruction, can have a tendency to weaken that principle, or its binding and paramount influence upon Congress and the country in all time to come. The precedent above quoted from the Congress of 1790, shows that the House of Representatives of that day, so far from fearing the effect of such action upon its part, sought to record its solemn conviction upon this question of power in themselves, and has handed down to us its judgment, in precise accordance with our own. That House was largely, if not entirely, composed of men of the revolution, and many of its members are known to have been also members of the convention which formed the Federal Constitution. Since that period, nearly half a century has rolled away, and now that the successors of that House, acting under the same considerations, solemnly reaffirm the principle laid down by those great and good men, and avow it to be not only the settled opinion of this Congress, but of the great body of the people of the United States, may we not hope, and indeed conclude, that it will be hereafter deemed a solemn and deliberate exposition of the constitution, and that all attempts in future to violate those sacred compromises, which lie at the very foundation of our constitutional compact, or to excite apprehension on this subject, will be effectually counteracted and defeated? Your committee cannot but indulge a most confident and animated hope that these good effects will be produced by the present action of the House.

Your committee are instructed to report, in the second place,

That, in the opinion of this House, Congress ought not to interfere, in any way, with slavery in the District of Columbia.

1st. Because it would be a violation of the public faith.

To obey this instruction of the House in the manner pointed out by the resolution, it will be necessary to examine, to some extent, the relations between the federal government and the District of Columbia, the probable objects of the provision in the constitution, authorizing the cession of the District to the United States, and the consequent expectations which may have been rationally entertained by the states that made the cession, as to the exercise, by Congress, of the powers granted to it over the ceded territory. Before entering upon this examination, however, it may be well to remark, that the powers of Congress over the District involved in this discussion, are wholly independent of, and derived from a source entirely separate from, the general legislative powers granted to Congress by the constitution. As the legislature of confederated states, the powers of Congress are equal, and of universal application, throughout all the states; and they were given to Congress before the cession of the District, and were held and exercised independently thereof. This will be made manifest by a brief statement of facts. The first Congress under the constitution, assembled on the 4th of March, 1789, and the government provided for by the constitution was organized on that day. The general powers conferred on the different branches of the federal government, were exercised from that day forward; and the union of the states, under constitutional government, was then perfected and put in practical operation. The cession from Virginia, of that portion of the District of Columbia that belonged to her, was not made until the 3d December of that year—nine months after the federal government had been in operation;* and the cession by Maryland, of that portion of the District that belonged to her, (and in which the seat of government is in fact located,) was not made until the 19th day of December, 1791†—more than two years and nine months after the existence of the government in its present constitutional form. Congress did not, in fact, remove to the District thus ceded, nor did the District thus ceded become practically the seat of government, until the year 1800; and the laws of the states by which the District was ceded, were declared by an act of Congress of the 16th July, 1790,‡ 'to be in force within the District until the removal of the government to it, and until Congress shall otherwise by law direct.'

It appears, then, that the federal government was in operation under the constitution nearly a year before Congress possessed any power of local legislation over any portion of the District of Columbia, and nearly three years before that power became as extensive as the present bounds of the District, or included that portion of the ten miles square in which the seat of government is in fact located.—It also appears, that the first act of the federal legislature in reference to its jurisdiction then partly acquired, and partly to be acquired, was to provide for the continuance, in all their force, and in every particular within the District, of the laws of the states that made the cession, until December, 1800—a period of nine years after the time when the powers of Congress, as a local legislature for the District, were perfected by the state of Maryland. Nor is this all; by the act of 1790, it was declared, as has been already shown, that the laws of Maryland and Virginia should be the laws of the District, not only 'until the time fixed for the removal of the government thereto,' but also 'until Congress shall otherwise provide by law.' No alteration, however, to any considerable extent has yet been made, and the laws of Virginia and Maryland which were in force at the time of their respective cessions, and in force respectively in the portions of the District ceded by each, still continue to be, in almost every particular, the local laws of the District of Columbia.

Such are the relations at present existing between the federal government and the District, so far as local legislation is concerned. The powers of Congress, as the local legislature of the District, were derived from the cessions by Virginia and Maryland, and the special grant of exclusive legislation, and not from the general powers conferred upon it by the constitution; and these special and local powers which Congress has now possessed for nearly half a century, have been exercised only to the extent above described, and, from the best information your committee have been able to obtain, to no other or greater extent.

The right of Congress to accept the cession of this territory from the states of Virginia and Maryland, is found in the eighth section of the first article of the Constitution of the United States, which gives it power 'to exercise exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever over such District, not exceeding ten miles square, as may by cession of particular states, and the acceptance of Congress, become the seat of government of the United States;' and the purpose for which the cession was to be made and received, is declared in the language of the constitution itself, 'such District as may become the seat of government of the United States.' The cession, therefore, was to be made for this purpose, and for no other; and, as regards its use by the federal government, the object of this provision evidently was simply to authorize Congress to accept the grant, and to exercise the powers of legislation therein provided for.

It will be conceded by the committee, for the purpose of this report, that the cession was made in conformity with the power of Congress to receive, and that, therefore, by the cession from Virginia and Maryland, Congress is in possession of the powers which the constitution intended it should possess over the District intended to be ceded.

This brings us to the inquiry, as to the probable objects of the grant of 'exclusive legislation in all cases whatsoever,' over the territory which was to constitute the seat of government of the United States. In consulting the commentators upon the constitution, it will be found that the old Congress encountered inconveniences, and even dangers, from holding their sessions where state legislatures had exclusive local jurisdiction, and where state authorities alone were to be depended on in matters of police and personal protection. Indeed, an adjournment of that Congress from the state of Pennsylvania to New Jersey, for a cause of this description, which occurred at the close of the revolutionary war, no doubt contributed greatly to the introduction of this clause into the constitution of the Union. The proceedings of the old Congress show distinctly that the acquirement of a territory for the seat of the federal legislature, over which it should have exclusive or special jurisdiction, was a favorite idea with that body as early as the year 1783, and that it continued up to the time of the formation of the constitution. Upon this point, your committee will only detain the House with a few of the resolutions adopted by the old Congress, that go to establish it. On the 7th of October, 1783, a resolution was passed, 'that buildings for the use of Congress, be erected on or near the banks of the Delaware,‖ provided a suitable district can be procured on or near the banks of the said river for a federal town, and that the right of soil, and exclusive, or such other jurisdiction as Congress may direct, shall be vested in the United States.' On the 21st of the same month (October, 1783), another resolution was passed, preceded by a preamble as follows: 'Whereas, there is reason to expect that the providing buildings for the alternate residence of Congress in two places, will be productive of the most salutary effects, by securing the mutual confidence and affections of the states, *Resolved*, That buildings be provided for the use of Congress at or near the lower falls of the Potomac,§ or Georgetown, provided a suitable district on the banks of the river can be procured for a federal town, and the right of soil, and an exclusive jurisdiction, or such other as Congress may direct, shall be vested in the United States.'

On the 20th of December, 1784, the old Congress passed, among others, the following resolutions:

Resolved, That it is expedient that Congress proceed to take measures for procuring suitable buildings to be erected for their accommodation.

Resolved, That it is inexpedient for Congress, at this time, to erect public buildings for their accommodation at more than one place.

These resolutions by the continental Congress, as to the expediency and necessity for a territory for the seat of the federal government, over which it should have peculiar if not exclusive jurisdiction, are produced to show the origin of the provision in the constitution upon that subject, and the object for which the acquisition of such a territory was desired. That object, beyond all question, was to secure a seat for the federal government, where the power of self-protection should be ample and complete, and where it might be exercised without collision or conflict with the legislative powers of any of the states, so far as its exercise should be required for the great national purposes for which the peculiar or exclusive jurisdiction was sought to be obtained. The jurisdiction was made exclusive, not, as your committee believe, and as they think every considerate citizen will admit, to change the object of the grant of the jurisdiction when it should be made, but to secure that object more effectually by making the federal government independent of state interference and of state protection, within the district where it was to be located, and where its deliberations should be held. Had the legislative power of Congress over this District not been made exclusive, one of the great and wise objects intended to be secured—the prevention of conflict between federal and state legislation, would have been necessarily defeated. Every statesman will admit the extreme inconvenience and danger of granting powers of legislation of the same character, and to be exercised within the same territory (powers of local and municipal legislation) to two distinct and independent legislative bodies; and the extreme difficulty, if not impossibility, of so defining the portions of power to be exercised by each, as to prevent constant conflict and collision. This must have been the result, if any division of the powers of local legislation, within the District of Columbia, had been made between Congress and the states by which the territory was ceded to the United States. Congress required all that power which, through all time, would be indispensably necessary for its own protection, and also to render all the departments of the federal government independent of state authority, and entirely dependent on, and obedient to, the federal legislature, and it alone, in all matters of police or municipal legislation. The adoption of the federal constitution by the people of the several states, with this provision in it, shows that the attainment of these objects was considered of paramount importance; and hence, in the judgment of your committee, the power in question was made exclusive.

Assuming the correctness of these premises, the next inquiry is, what expectations were the states by which the District was ceded, as well as their sister states, authorized to entertain as to the exercise, by Congress, of the legislative powers derived from these cessions? The cessions included not only a portion of the territory of those states, but also a portion of their citizens. To secure the great national objects intended by the cession, the jurisdiction of the states over those citizens, as well as over the territory of the District, was transferred to the federal legislature. This transfer, from the necessity of the case, abridged the rights of the citizens within the territory, who had been formerly entitled to vote for their legislators and other rulers, by subjecting them to a government composed of persons in whose election they were to have no choice. Their governance, however, was confided to those entrusted with the common government of all the states; and when we reflect upon the confidence reposed in Congress by the states that made the transfer, and by the citizens transferred, it accounts at once for the readiness with which the cession was effected. Still the question recurs, what expectations might reasonably be entertained by the states making the cession, by the other states of the confederacy, so far as their interests were directly or indirectly involved, and by the citizens thus placed under the peculiar care of Congress, as to its exercise of the powers conferred upon it by this cession of territories for a seat of the federal government?

Your committee have no hesitation to say, in answer to this inquiry, that those expectations, by all the parties interested, not only might, but must have been, that Congress would exercise the powers conferred, so far as their exercise should be found necessary for the great national objects of the cession, with strict reference to the accomplishment of those objects; and that all other powers conferred by the cession would be exercised with an equally strict reference to the interests and welfare of the inhabitants of the District—these citizens of two free states who had been made dependent on Congress for their local legislation, for the protection of life, liberty, and property—rights guaranteed by the constitution to all the citizens of the confederacy,—in order that a seat for the federal government, subject to the exclusive control of Congress, might be granted to it. If these positions are correct, it follows necessarily that the institutions, the customs, the rights, the property, and every other incident pertaining to those citizens, and municipal in its character, which they enjoyed as citizens of the states to which they belonged before the cession of the District, and which did not then, and have not yet, interfered with the great national rights and privileges intended to be secured by the cession, should have been hitherto, and should be in all time to come, guarded and preserved with the same parental care and kindness with which the legislatures of the states to which they belonged, would have guarded and protected them if they had continued to be entrusted to their respective jurisdictions

Your committee rely confidently upon this as the great rule for the faithful action of Congress in reference to this subject. They feel assured that no rational man will differ with them. Two questions, then, remain to be considered, to determine whether Congress should or should not attempt to interfere with slavery, viz:

1. Do the great national objects which were intended to be secured to the Federal Government by the cession of the territory require such action on the part of Congress?

Your committee will make no argument upon so plain a proposition. No individual within their knowledge, not even the most deluded fanatic, has ever asked, or attempted to justify, a measure of this description upon such a pretext. The security and independence of Congress, from the moment of its removal to this District to the present hour, have been as perfect as the framers of the constitution could have desired. No intimation has ever been heard that the existence of slavery in the District of Columbia has ever produced the slightest danger or inconvenience either to the interests or the officers of the Federal Government within it. Surely then, Congress cannot be called upon to interfere with that institution within the District as one of its duties growing out of the national objects connected with the cession; and if such interference is demanded from it, the demand must grow out of its relations to the District as a local legislature. This brings the committee to the remaining question.

2. Would the States of Maryland and Virginia, if the cession of this territory to the Federal Government had not been made, from anything which has been shown to Congress, be induced to interfere with, or abolish, the institution of domestic slavery within it?

At the time of the cession from those states, slavery existed in every portion of their territory, in the same degree, and subject to the same laws and regulations by which it was authorized and regulated in the territory ceded to the federal government. It still exists in those states, without any material variation or modification of their laws respecting it. As those states, then, have not abolished it within the territories remaining under their jurisdiction, is it reasonable to suppose that they would have abolished it in the territory comprising the District, had they continued to retain their original jurisdiction over it? Can any reason whatever be given for the abolition of slavery in this particular District, which does not apply with equal force to every other slaveholding section of the country? Can any cause be shown why the states of Maryland and Virginia would have abolished, or would now abolish, slavery in this District, had it continued to form a part of those states respectively, which would not have warranted or produced general abolition throughout those states? Most unquestionably not! As those states, then, have not abolished slavery in the residue of their territory, it is evident that they would not have abolished it in the District of Columbia, if it had continued subject to their action. It follows conclusively, therefore, that Congress, as the local legislature of the District, and acting independently of the national consideration connected with its powers over it, is bound, for the preservation of the public faith, and the rights of all the parties interested, to act upon the same reasons, and to exercise the same parental regard, which would have governed the states by which the District was ceded to the federal government. And it is unnecessary to add, that Congress has acted wisely in treating the institutions found in existence at the time of the cession, as the institutions of the people of the District; in continuing their laws and customs, as the laws and customs to which they had been used, and which should never be altered, or interfered with, except where the people themselves may be desirous of a change.

Your committee must go further, and express their full conviction, that any interference by Congress with the private interests or rights of the citizens of this District, without their consent, would be a breach of the faith reposed in the federal government by the states that made the cession, and as violent an infraction of private rights as it would have been if those states themselves, supposing their jurisdiction had remained unimpaired over their respective limits, had abolished slavery within those portions of their respective limits, and had continued its existence, upon its present basis, in every other portion of them. And surely there is no citizen, in any quarter of the country, who has the smallest regard for our laws and institutions, state and national, or for equal justice, and an equality of rights and privileges among citizens entitled to it, who would attempt to justify such an outrage on the part of those states. The question then is, Are the citizens of the District desirous of a change themselves? Has any request or movement been made by them that would justify an interference with their private rights on the part of Congress? None, whatever! The citizens of the District not only have not solicited any action on the part of Congress, but it is well known that they earnestly deprecate such action and regard, with abhorrence, the efforts that are made by others, who have no interest whatever in the District, to effect it. It is impossible, therefore, that any such interference on the part of Congress could be justified, or even palliated, on the ground that it was sought or desired by those who are alone interested in the subject. If therefore, Congress was to interfere with this description of property against the consent of the people of the District, your committee feel bound to say, that it would be as gross a breach of public faith, and as outrageous an infraction of public rights, as it would have been if such an interference had been committed by the states of which the District was formerly a part, supposing that it never had been ceded to the United States.

Your committee will here anticipate an objection which may be urged against this reasoning and these conclusions. They have shown that the powers of Congress over this District divide themselves into two classes, national and local; that in reference to the former, the action of Congress should be governed by the interests of the whole country, so far as they are connected with the branches of the federal government located within the District; that in reference to the latter, its powers are, and its actions should be, those of a local and municipal legislature, extending its paternal care and protection over the citizens dependent upon, and subjected to, this branch of its authority; that in the exercise of its powers, the safest stand in reference to slavery is, what would the states to which the District originally belonged, and of which its citizens were originally citizens, have done in case their jurisdiction had never been transferred to Congress, and that those states would certainly not have interfered with the institution of slavery in the District, had the power to do so remained with them. The objection anticipated is, that the states in question have pursued an unwise policy as to themselves, and that their having done so should not have bound Congress, as the local legislature of the District, to a similar policy in relation to its government. To this, however, your committee consider it perfectly conclusive to reply, that under our institutions, that people is the best governed, which is governed most in accordance with its own habits, interests, and wishes; that the policy hitherto pursued by Congress in reference to slavery in the District,

your committee have every reason to believe, has been in perfect conformity with the wishes and interests of the citizens concerned; and that it will be time enough for Congress, acting as the local legislature of the District, and in that capacity bound to consult the governed, as the regulators of its action, to move in any matter relating to their private interests and rights when they themselves shall ask such movement.

There is another consideration connected with this part of the argument, which your committee think worthy of attention. It is this: that there is no law in the District prohibiting the master from manumitting his slaves, which he may do at his own discretion, and without incurring any responsibility whatever. Certain it is that no such law has been passed by Congress. The citizens of the District, therefore, have no necessity for the aid of Congress, should they wish the abolition of slavery among them. They have only to exercise an existing right, and their wish will be accomplished. Can there be more decisive evidence, then, that they do not wish the abolition of slavery, than that it continues to exist among them? or can any one desire more conclusive proof that any attempt by Congress to effect this object by force of law would be an interference with the rights of private property, against the wishes and consent of those concerned, and for none of the purposes for which Congress is authorized by the constitution to take private property for public use?

Hence, your committee believe they have proved, beyond the power of contradiction, that an interference by Congress with slavery in the District of Columbia would be a violation of the public faith—of the faith reposed in Congress by the states which ceded the territory to the federal government, so far as the rights and interests of those citizens residing within the ceded territory are concerned.

Your committee will now consider this proposition in reference to the interests of the states of Maryland and Virginia. These were slaveholding states at the time they made their cession, and they are so still. They entirely surround this District, from which they are only separated upon all sides by imaginary lines. They made the cession for the great national objects which have been already pointed out, and they made it from motives of patriotism alone, and without any compensation from the federal government for the surrender of jurisdiction over commanding positions in both states. The surrender was made for purposes deemed sufficiently important, by all the original states, to be provided for in the constitution of the United States; and it was made in conformity with that provision of the constitution. It is surely unnecessary after this statement of facts, to undertake to show that those patriotic states made this cession for purposes o good to the Union, and consequently to themselves, and not for purposes of evil to themselves, and consequently to the Union; and that the government of the United States accepted the cession for the same good, and not for evil, purposes.

If, then, it can be demonstrated that the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia would produce evil, and not good, to the states that made the cession, the conclusion is inevitable that such an act on the part of Congress would be a violation of the faith reposed in it by those states. To all to whom this is not perfectly palpable without an argument, the following considerations are presented:

It has been already said that the States of Maryland and Virginia surround the District. It has also been shown that, in reference to slavery within the District, the relations of Congress are entirely those of a local legislature, and that its action, therefore, in this capacity, should be governed by the same reasons which would have governed those states themselves in relation to this subject, if their jurisdiction over this territory had never been surrendered. Let us suppose, then, that this jurisdiction had never been surrendered by Maryland and Virginia, and that it was now proposed that they should abolish slavery, and relinquish all power of legislation over free blacks, within the portions of those states which constitute the District of Columbia, retaining their respective institutions of slavery, in all the remaining portions of their territory. Who is there that would not be amazed at the folly of such an act? Who does not see that such a step would necessarily produce discontent and insurrections in the remaining portions of those states? Who does not perceive that under such circumstances the District would constitute at once a neutral ground, upon which hosts of free blacks, fugitive slaves, and incendiaries, would be assembled in the work of general abolitionism; and that from such a magazine of evil, every conceivable mischief would be spread through the surrounding country, with almost the rapidity of the movements of the atmosphere? Surely no one can doubt the certainty of the consequencial evils in the case supposed. How then can any doubt or deny the dangers in the case before us? The territory is the same; it is surrounded by the same portions of slaveholding states; and the only difference is, that in the case supposed, the abolition would be the work of state authorities, while in the other, it is sought to accomplish it by the authority of Congress. The condition of things before and after it is done, is the same in both cases, and the opportunities for mischief, in case the work be accomplished, are equal in both. Can it be necessary to say more, to establish the position, that any interference with slavery in the District of Columbia on the part of Congress, would be a violation of the public faith, the faith reposed in Congress by those states, and without which they never could have been induced to have made that cession?

It only remains under this head to show that Congress could not interfere with slavery in the District of Columbia, without a violation of the public faith, in reference to the slaveholding states generally, as well as to the states of Virginia and Maryland. The provision in the constitution authorizing Congress to accept the cession of a territory for a seat of the Federal Government, and to exercise exclusive jurisdiction over it, was as general and universal as any other provision in that instrument. In its national objects all the states were equally interested, and so far as there was any danger that the powers of local legislation conferred on Congress might interfere with, or injuriously affect, the institutions of the various States, each State possessed an interest proportioned to the probable danger to itself. As far as your committee know or believe, however, no apprehension of an interference on the subject of domestic slavery was entertained in any quarter, or expressed by any statesmen of the day. An examination of the commentaries on the constitution will show that various apprehensions were entertained, as to the powers conferred on Congress, by this clause, such as that privileged classes of society might be created within the District, that a standing army, dangerous to the liberties of the country, might be organized and sustained within it, and the like; but not a suggestion can be found, that under the local powers to be conferred, any attempt would be made to interfere with the private rights of the citizens who might be embraced within the District, or to disturb, or change, directly, or by consequence, the municipal institutions of the States, or that the subject of domestic slavery, as it existed in the States, could be in any way involved in the proposed cession. At that time, all the states held slaves. Many of them have since, by their own independent action, without influence or interference from the Federal Government, or from their sister States, effected, in their own time and way, the work of emancipation; others of the original States remain as they were at the time of the adoption of the constitution, in reference to this description of property, and several new members have been admitted into the Union as slaveholding States. All the States which have held, or now hold, slave property, have invariably considered the institution as one exclusively subject to State authority, and not to be affected directly or indirectly, by Federal interference. The practice of the Government, as well as its theory, has established this doctrine, and the action of the States, in retaining or abolishing this institution at pleasure, has conformed entirely to this principle. Now the subject of Federal interference has become one of some agitation, and Congress is solicited to adopt measures in relation to the District of Columbia, which have been shown to be most dangerous and destructive to the security and interests of the two slaveholding States by which it was ceded to the Federal Government. Your Committee will not trouble the House to prove, that any measure of the Federal Legislature, which would have this tendency in those two States, would from the very necessity of the case, and the unity of the interest wherever it exists, have the same tendency, measurably, in all the other slaveholding members of the Union. This position is too plain for argument. If, then, all the States were equally interested in the national objects for which this territory was ceded as the seat of the Federal Government: if that cession was designed by the framers of the constitution, to tend to the benefit of the whole confederacy, and was made in furtherance of that design; and if Congress, contrary to the obvious intent and spirit of the cession, shall do an act not required by the national objects contemplated by it, but directly repugnant to the interests and wishes of the citizens of the ceded territory, and calculated to disturb the peace, and endanger the interests, of the slaveholding members of the Union, such an act must be in violation of the public faith; of the faith reposed in Congress by the States that made the cession, and which would be deeply injured by such an exercise of power under it; and also of the faith reposed in that body by all the States, inasmuch as no independent State in the Union can be injured in its peace, or its rightful interests by the action of the Federal Government, without a corresponding injury to every member of the confederated States.

Your committee have already shown that an interference with slavery in the District of Columbia, would involve a violation of the public faith, as regards the rights and interests of the citizens thereof. They recur to this topic, however, on account of its importance, and for the purpose of putting it in another light, and as they consider, upon unanswerable ground. They are aware that, under the constitution,¶ Congress possesses 'exclusive legislation' over the aforesaid District, but the power of legislation was given to be exercised for beneficial purposes only, and cannot, therefore, be exercised, consistently with public faith, for any object that is at war with the great principles upon which the Government itself is founded. The constitution, to be properly understood, must be taken as a whole. Wherever a particular power is granted, the extent to which it may be carried, can only be inferred from other provisions by which it may be regulated or restrained. The constitution, while it confers upon Congress exclusive legislation within this District, does not, and could not, confer unlimited despotic authority over it. It could confer no power contrary to the fundamental principles of the constitution itself, and the essential and unalienable rights of American citizens. The right to legislate, therefore, (to make the constitution consistent with itself,) is evidently qualified by the provision that 'no man shall be deprived of life, liberty, or property, without due form of law,'** and various others of a similar character. We lay it down as a rule, that no Government can do anything repugnant to the principles of natural justice and of the social compact. It would be totally subversive of all the purposes for which government is instituted. Vattel says: 'The great end of civil society is, whatever constitutes happiness with the peaceful possession of property.' No republican would tolerate that a man should be punished, by a special statute, for an act not legally punishable at the time of its commission. No republican could approve any system of legislation by which private contracts, lawfully made, should be declared null and void, or by which the property of an individual, lawfully acquired, should be arbitrarily wrested from him by the high hand of power. But these great principles are not left for their support to the natural feelings of the human heart, or to the mere general spirit of republican government. They are expressly incorporated in the constitution, and they have also been recognized, and insisted on, by the Supreme Court of the United States, which lays down the following sound and incontrovertible doctrine. 'There are acts which the Federal or State Legislatures can do, without exceeding their authority. There are certain vital principles in our free republican Government, which will determine and overrule an apparent and flagrant abuse of legislative power; as to authorize manifest injustice by positive law, or to take away that security for personal liberty or private property, for the protection whereof the Government was established. An act of the legislature, contrary to the great first principles of the social compact, cannot be considered a rightful exercise of legislative authority. The obligation of a law, in Governments established on express compact, and on republican principles, must be determined by the nature of the power on which it is founded. A few instances will suffice to explain. A law that punished a citizen for an innocent action, or that was in violation of an existing law; a law that destroys or impairs the obligation of the lawful private contracts of citizens; a law that makes a man a judge in his own case; or a law that takes property away from A, and gives it to B. It is against all reason and justice for a people to entrust a legislature with such powers, and therefore it cannot be presumed that they have done it. The legislature may enjoin or permit, forbid or punish; they may declare new crimes, and establish rules of conduct for future cases; but they cannot change innocence into guilt, or punish innocence as a crime, or violate the rights of an antecedent lawful private contract, or the right of private property. To maintain that our Federal or State Legislatures possess such powers, even if they had not been expressly restrained, would be a political heresy, altogether inadmissible in our free republican Government.'†† Now, every principle here affirmed by the court, applies to, and protects, the people of this District, as well as the people of the States. The inhabitants of this District are a part of the people of the United States. Every right and interest secured by the constitution to the people of the States, is equally secured to the people of the District. Congress can therefore do no act affecting property or person, in relation to this District, which it is prohibited to do in relation to the citizens of the States, without a direct violation of the public faith. For instance, it is a well settled constitutional principle, that 'private property shall not be taken for public use, without just compensation.' Now, the true meaning of this provision obviously is, that private property shall be taken only for public use, but shall not be taken even then, without adequate remuneration. It is evident, however, in reference to slavery, either that the Government would use the slaves, or that it would not. If it would use them, then they would not be emancipated: and it would be an idle mockery to talk of the freedom of those who would only cease to be private, to become public, slaves. If it would not use them, then how could it be said that they were taken for the public use, consistently with the provision just recited? But even if they could be taken without reference to public use, they could not be taken without just compensation. It is exceedingly questionable, however, whether Congress could legally apply the public revenue to such an object, even with the consent of the owners of the slaves.—As to emancipation without their consent, and without just compensation, your committee will not stop to consider it. It could not bear examination. Honor, humanity, policy, all forbid it. It is manifest, then, from all the considerations herein stated, (and there are others equally forcible that might be urged) that Congress could not abolish slavery in the District of Columbia, without a violation of the public faith.

Your committee will only add one or two reflections upon this interesting point.

What is the meaning of the declaration adopted by the House, in relation to the District of Columbia?—Is it not, that Congress cannot, and will not, do an act which it has solemnly proclaimed to involve a violation of the public faith? Does it not afford every security to the South which it is in the power of the Federal Government to afford? Is it not tantamount in its binding obligation upon the Government, to a positive declaration, that the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia would be unconstitutional?—Nay, is it not even more efficacious in point of fact? Constitutional provisions are matters of construction. The opinion of one House, upon an abstract, controverted point, may be overruled and reversed by another. But when Congress has solemnly declared that a particular act would be a violation of the public faith, is it to be supposed that it would ever violate a pledge thus given to the country? Can any abolitionist expect it? Need any citizen of a slave State fear it? What is public faith but the honor of the Government? Why are treaties regarded as sacred and inviolable? Why, but because they involve the pledge, and depend upon the sanctity of the national faith?—Why are all compacts or promises made by Governments held to be irrevocably binding? Why, but because they cannot break them without committing perfidy, and destroying all confidence in their justice and integrity? Surely, then, your committee may say with the utmost confidence, (and the sentiment will be ratified by every American heart,) that the declaration now promulgated in relation to this subject, will not be departed from by any succeeding legislature, except under circumstances (should any such ever arise in the progress of our country) in which a departure from it would not be regarded by the slaveholding States themselves, as a wanton or arbitrary infraction of the public faith!

Your committee are further instructed to report, that, in the opinion of this House, Congress ought not to interfere, in any way, with slavery in the District of Columbia—

2dly. Because it would be unwise and impolitic.

It will be palpable to the minds of all, that if the committee have succeeded in establishing, as they think they have, that any such interference on the part of Congress would be a violation of the public faith, it would be a work of supererogation to attempt to show that such an act would be unwise and impolitic: as there may be some, however, who may not agree with them in their arguments or conclusions upon that point, they feel bound, under the instruction of the House, to offer a few suggestions under this head!

The Federal Government was the creation of the States of the Confederacy, and the great objects of its creation and organization 'were to form a more perfect union, establish justice, ensure domestic tranquillity, and provide for the common defence and general welfare.'

Apply these principles, then, to an interference by Congress with slavery in the District of Columbia.—Such action, to be politic, must be in accordance with some one of those great objects; and it will be the duty of the committee, in as concise a manner as possible, to show that it would not be in accordance with either of them.

First, then, as to the District itself.

It has already been shown, that any interference, unsolicited by the inhabitants of the District, cannot 'establish justice,' or promote the cause of justice within it, but directly the reverse. No greater degree of slavery exists here now, than did exist when the constitution was adopted, and then the inhabitants of the District were citizens of the States of Maryland and Virginia, and had a voice in the adoption of that instrument. Surely their subsequent transfer to the jurisdiction of Congress, made in conformity with that constitution, could not deprive them of the protection to which they were entitled by these great leading principles of it. On the contrary, they had every right to expect that Congress would 'establish justice,' as to them, in strict compliance with the great charter under which it acted, and by which it is forbidden to interfere with the rights of private property, without their consent, or in any way to affect, injuriously, their domestic institutions. Of those institutions, slavery was, and is, the most important; and any attempt on the part of Congress, acting as the local Legislature of the District, to abolish it, would not only be impolitic, but an act of gross injustice and oppression.

Secondly, as to the States of the Union. Here again, your committee have but to refer to their former remarks, to show that the abolition of slavery in the District would not 'establish justice,' but work great injustice to the surrounding States in particular, and to all the slave States in general, and in a degree proportioned to their proximity to the District, and to the influence upon the institution of slavery in the Union, of such action on the part of Congress. They have also shown that the abolition of slavery here, so far from tending to 'ensure domestic tranquillity,' would have a direct tendency to produce domestic discord and violence, and servile war, in all the slaveholding States. As these consequences, then, would follow such action in reference to the States, your committee need not say, that, instead of providing for 'the common defence' by it, Congress would be called upon to provide for the 'common defence' in consequence of it, and to an extent which cannot now be foreseen. Seeing, then, that the American Confederacy was formed for the great objects of providing for 'the common defence and general welfare,' it follows necessarily, that Congress is not only restrained from the commision of any act by which these objects may be frustrated, but that it is bound to sustain and promote them. The same provision of the constitution,‡‡ which requires it to call out the militia to 'suppress insurrections,' unquestionably imposes the corresponding obligation upon it, to commit no act by which an insurrectionary spirit may be excited. The same provision which enjoins it on the Federal Government to 'guarantee to each State a republican form of government, and to aid and protect each State against domestic violence,'||| evidently implies the correlative obligation to take no step, of which the direct and inevitable tendency would be to overthrow the State Governments, and to involve them in wide spread scenes of misery and desolation. In one word, if it be the duty of Congress, as it most clearly is, to support and preserve the constitution and the Union, then it is manifest, that it is bound to avoid the adoption of any legislation which may lead to their destruction. Your committee consider these positions too obvious to require argument or illustration. They consider it equally manifest, that any attempt to abolish slavery in the District, would necessarily tend to the deplorable consequences to which they have adverted. Congress, therefore, is bound, by every principle of duty which forbids it to interfere with slavery in any of the States, to abstain from any similar interference in the District of Columbia.

Your committee have already adverted to the evils that would necessarily result to the surrounding States, and to the slave States generally, from any interference by Congress with the institution of slavery in the District of Columbia. The nature and magnitude of those evils, however, require that they should be exhibited more fully and distinctly. The question is, whether slavery ought to be abolished in the District of Columbia? Now, suppose the affirmative of this proposition were sustained by Congress, what would it be but indirect legislation, or rather direct interference, as regards the rights and property of the southern States? And can any one imagine that such a state of things would be patiently borne? But this is not all; nay, it is not half the evil that would follow. Could slavery be abolished in the District without leading directly or inevitably to insubordination and revolt throughout the south? And can any one desire to produce such results? Is there a man who has forgotten the history of St. Domingo, or the insurgent attempt at Charleston, or the tragical scenes at Southampton! or the recent and lamentable occurrences in the States of Louisiana and Mississippi? Or is there an individual who would wish them repeated, and extended throughout the entire region of the South? Why, then, will infatuated individuals persist in pressing a scheme, which is not only impracticable, as regards the States, but fraught with evil to the very objects it is proposed to benefit? True philanthropy would avoid this subject, seeing the distraction it creates, and the dreadful consequences it involves. It would leave it to those whom it most concerns, and who alone are competent to act upon it. It would trust to time and to the gradual operation of causes which may arise of themselves, but which can neither be produced nor hastened by foreign interference, or the power of this Government. Why, then, your committee earnestly repeal, why urge a measure which is clearly impracticable in itself, which none but the slaveholding States have a right to act on, and which has increased, and will always increase the hardships and restraints of those for whose imaginary benefit they are waging this cruel and fanatical crusade?

We have said that the scheme of general emancipation is impracticable. The slightest reflection must satisfy every candid mind of the truth of this assertion.

Admitting that the Federal Government had a right to act upon this matter, which it clearly has not, it certainly never could achieve such an operation without full compensation to the owners. And what would probably be the amount required? The aggregate value of all that species of property is not less probably than four millions of dollars! And how could such an amount be raised? Will the people of this country ever consent to the imposition of oppressive taxes, that the proceeds may be applied to the purchase of slaves? The idea is preposterous; and not only that, but it is susceptible of demonstration, that even if an annual appropriation of ten millions were actually applied to the purchase and transportation of slaves, the whole number would not be sensibly diminished at the expiration of half a century, from the natural growth and multiplication of the race. Burthen the Treasury as we might, it would still be an endless expense and an interminable work. And this view of the subject surely is sufficient of itself to prove that of all the schemes ever projected by fanaticism, the idea of universal emancipation is the most visionary and impracticable.

But even if the scheme were practicable, what would be gained by effecting it? Suppose that Congress could emancipate all the slaves in the Union, is such a result desirable? This question is addressed to the sober sense of the people of America. Would it be politic or advantageous? Would it contribute to the wealth, or grandeur, or happiness of our country? On the contrary, would it not produce consequences directly the reverse? Are not the slaves unfit for freedom; notoriously ignorant, servile and depraved? And would any rational man have them instantaneously transformed into freedom, with all the rights and privileges of American citizens? Are they capable of understanding correctly the nature of our Government, or exercising judiciously a single political right or privilege? Nay, would they even be capable of earning their own livelihood, or rearing their families independently by their own ingenuity and industry! What, then, would follow from their liberation, but the most deplorable state of society with which any civilized country was ever cursed? How would vice, and immorality, and licentiousness, overrun the land? How many jails and penitentiaries that now seldom hold a prisoner, would be crowded to suffocation? How many fertile fields, that now yield regular and abundant harvests, would lie unoccupied and desolate? How would the foreign commerce of the South decline and disappear? How many thousands of seamen, of whom Southern agriculture is the very life, would be driven for support to foreign countries? And how large a portion of the federal revenue, derived from foreign commodities exchanged for Southern products, would be lost forever to this Government? And, in addition to all this, what would be the condition of southern society, were all the slaves emancipated? Would the whites consent that the blacks should be placed upon a full footing of equality with them? Unquestionably not! Either the one class or the other would be forced to emigrate, and, in either case, the whole region of the south would be a scene of poverty and ruin. Or, what is still more probable, the blacks would every where be driven before the whites, as the Indians have been, until they were exterminated from the earth. And surely it is unnecessary to remark, that decay and desolation could not break down the south, without producing a corresponding depression upon the wealth and enterprise of the northern States. And here let us ask, too, what would be the condition of the non-slaveholding States themselves, as regards the blacks? Are they prepared to receive myriads of negroes, and place them upon an equality with the free white laborers and mechanics, who constitute their pride and strength? Will the new states consent that their territory shall be occupied by negroes, instead of the enterprising, intelligent, and patriotic white population, which is daily seeking their borders from other portions of the Union? Shall the yeomanry of those States be surrounded by thousands of such beings, and the white laborer forced into competition and association with them? Are they to enjoy the same civil and political privileges as the free white citizens of the north and west, and to be admitted into the social circle as their friends and companions? Nothing less than all this will constitute perfect freedom, and the principles now maintained by those who advocate emancipation would, if carried out, necessarily produce this state of things! Yet, who believes, that it would be tolerated for a moment? Already have laws been passed in several of the non-slaveholding States to exclude free blacks from a settlement within their limits, and a prospect of general and immediate abolition would compel them, in self-defence, to resort to a system of measures much more rigorous and effective than any which have yet been adopted. Driven from the south, the blacks would find no place of refuge in the north; and, as before remarked, utter extermination would be the probable, if not the inevitable fate of the whole race. Where is the citizen then, that can desire such results? Where the American who can contemplate them without emotion? Where the abolitionist that will not pause, in view of the direful consequences of his scheme, both to the whites and the blacks, to the north and the south, and to the whole Union at large?

Your committee deem it their duty to say that, in their opinion, the people of the south have been very unjustly censured in reference to slavery. It is not their purpose, however, to defend them. Their character, as men and citizens, needs no vindication from us. Wherever it is known it speaks for itself, nor would any wantonly traduce it, but those assassins of reputation, who are also willing to be the destroyers of life. Exaggerated pictures have been drawn of the hardships of the slave, and every effort made to malign the south, and to enlist against it both the religious and political feelings of the north. Your committee cannot too strongly express their unanimous and unqualified disapprobation of all such movements The constitution under which we live, was framed by our common ancestors to preserve the liberty and independence achieved by their united efforts in the council and in the field. In all our contests with foreign enemies, the south has exhibited an unwavering attachment to the common cause. Where is the spot of which Americans are prouder than the plains of Yorktown? Or, when was Briton more humbled, or America more honored, than by the victory of New Orleans? All our history, from the revolution down, attests the high and uniform, and devoted patriotism of the south. Her domestic institutions are her own. They were brought into the Union with her, and secured by the compact which makes us one people, and he who would sow dissensions among members of the same great political family, by assailing the institutions, and impugning the character of the citizens of the south, should be regarded as an enemy to the peace and prosperity of our common country.

If there is a feature by which the present age may be said to be characterised, it is that sickly sentimentality which, disregarding the pressing claims and wants of its own immediate neighborhood, or town, or State, wastes and dissipates itself in visionary, and often very mischievous enterprises, for the imaginary benefit of remote communities. True philanthropy, rightly understood and properly applied, is one of the purest and most ennobling principles of our nature; but, misdirected or perverted, it degenerates into that fell spirit of fanaticism which disregards all ties, and tramples on all obstacles, however sacred or venerable, in the relentless prosecution of its horrid purposes. Experience proves, however, that, when individuals in one place, mistaking the true character of benevolence, rashly undertake, at the imminent hazzard of conflict and convulsion, to remedy what they are pleased to consider evils and distresses in another, it is naturally regarded by those who are thus injured, either as a species of madness which may be repelled or resisted, as any other madness may, or as manifesting a feeling of hostility on the one side, which must necessarily produce corresponding alienations on the other. It is all important, therefore, that the spirit of abolition, or in other words, of illegal and officious interference with the domestic institutions of the south, should be arrested and put down; and men of intelligence and influence at the north should endeavor to produce that sound and rational state of public opinion which is equally due to the south and to the preservation of the Union.

And this brings your committee to the last position they have been instructed to sustain; and that is, that in the opinion of the House, Congress ought not to interfere, in any way, with slavery in the District of Columbia.

3dly. Because it would be dangerous to the Union.

The first great object enumerated in the constitution, as an inducement to its adoption, was to 'form a more perfect union.' At that time all the States held slaves, to a greater or less extent; and slavery in the States was fully recognized and provided for, in many particulars, in that instrument itself. It was recognized, however, and all the provisions upon the subject so regarded it, as a State, not as a national institution. At that time, too, as has been before remarked, the District of Columbia constituted an integral part of two of the independent States which became parties to the Confederacy and to the constitution itself. Since that time an entire emancipation of slaves has taken place in several of the old States; but in all cases this has been the work of the States themselves, without any interference whatever by the Federal Government. New States have also been admitted into the Union, with an interdiction in their constitutions against involuntary servitude. In this way, the slave States have become a minority in representation in the Federal Legislature. Their interests, however, as States, in the institution of domestic slavery, as it exists within their limits, have not diminished, nor has their right to perfect security under the constitution, in reference to this description of property, been in any way, or to any degree, surrendered or impaired, since the adoption of that instrument by themselves and their sister States.

The operation of causes, to a great extent natural, and proceeding from climate, soil and consequent production, has rendered slavery a local and sectional institution, and has thus added another to the most alarming apprehensions of patriots for the perpetuity of this Union—the apprehension of local and geographical interests and distinctions. How immensely important is it then, that Congress should do no act, and assume no jurisdiction, in reference to this great interest, by which it shall ever appear to place itself in the attitude of a local, instead of a national tribunal—a partial agent, providing for peculiar and sectional objects and feelings, instead of a general and paternal legislature, equally and impartially promoting the welfare of all the States. No one can fail to see, that any other course on the part of Congress must weaken the confidence of the injured States in the federal authority, and to the same extent, prove 'dangerous to the Union.'

Since the adoption of the Federal Constitution, the District of Columbia has been ceded to the United States as a seat of the Federal Government; but not only many eminent statesmen of the country, but all of the slaveholding States, speaking through their legislative assemblies, firmly believe and insist that the cession so made, has conferred upon Congress no constitutional power to abolish slavery within the ceded territory. Your committee have abstained from an examination of this question, because they were not instructed to discuss it. But they have no hesitation to say, that, in the view they have taken of the whole question, the obligations of Congress not to act on this subject are as fully binding and insuperable as a positive constitutional interdict, or an open acknowledgment of want of power.

Considering the subject in this light, your committee have already proved, that any interference by Congress with the subject of slavery, would be evidently calculated to injure the interests and disturb the peace of the slaveholding States; and if they have succeeded in establishing this position, no argument is necessary to show, that such consequences, springing from the action of Congress as the local legislature of the District, would eminently endanger the existence of this Union. It has also been shown, that Congress, as the legislature of the Union, can have no constitutional power over this subject; and that its powers, as a local legislature of the District, were granted for the mere purpose of rendering its general powers perfect and free from conflict and collision with State authorities. It has also been shown that these local powers should be so exercised as to confer the greatest benefits upon the citizens residing within the District, with the least possible injury to the peculiar interests of any State, or the general interests of all the States. Your committee have also shown, as they think successfully, that the abolition of slavery in the District of Columbia would be a deep injury to the citizens of the District, and, therefore, a violation of the trust reposed in Congress as the local legislature of the District; and, also, that it would inflict an incurable injury upon all the slaveholding States, and would, therefore, be an equal violation of the trust reposed in that body as the Legislature of the Union. If, then, they have established these positions, as they think they have, can any one doubt that the action contemplated would be 'dangerous to the Union?' being directly calculated, as it would be, to weaken the confidence of the District in Congress as a safe and faithful local legislature, and the confidence of the slaveholding States as an impartial guardian of their interests.

Important as the Union is to each State, and to the whole American people, every one will admit that, as far as possible, strict impartiality and kind feelings to all the interests and all the sections of the country should characterize the action of the Federal Government. The Union was formed for the common and equal benefit of all the States, and for the perfect and equal protection of the rights and interests of all the States. Its only strength is in the confidence of the States, and of the people, that these great benefits will continue to be secured to them, and that these great purposes will be accomplished by its preservation. Any action, therefore, on the part of Congress, which shall weaken or destroy that confidence in any portion of our citizens, or in any State of the Union, must inevitably, to that extent, endanger the Union itself? Who can doubt this reasoning? Who does not know that the agitation of any question connected with domestic slavery, as it exists in this country, among any portion of our citizens, creates apprehension and excitement in the slaveholding States? Who does not know that the agitation of any such question in either branch of Congress, shakes their confidence in the security of their most important interests, and, consequently, in the continuance to them of these great benefits, to secure which they became parties to the Union? Who then does not believe that any action by Congress, having for its object the abolition of slavery in any portion of the Union, however narrow or limited it may be, would necessarily impair the confidence of the slaveholding States in their security in relation to this description of property, put an end to all their hope of benefits to be derived to them from the further continuance of the Union, and alienate their affections from it? Were Congress in a single instance, to suffer itself to be impelled by mere feeling in one portion of the Union, to attempt a gratification of that feeling at the sacrifice of the dearest interests and most sacred rights of another portion, who can doubt that the Union would be seriously endangered, if not destroyed? But this conclusion does not depend upon reasoning alone. The evidences of public sentiment on this point, are equally abundant and decisive. Your committee having already extended their report beyond the limits to which they could have wished to confine it, will enter into no details upon this portion of their duty. Suffice it to say that the legislatures of several, if not all, the slaveholding States, have solemnly resolved that 'Congress has no constitutional authority to abolish slavery in the District of Columbia.' It would be utterly impossible, therefore, that any such attempt should be made involving consequences, which no patriot can contemplate without the most painful emotions. It would be regarded by the slaveholding States as an entering wedge to a scheme of general emancipation, and, therefore, tend to produce the same results, in relation to the Federal Government and the Union, that would be produced by the adoption of any measure directly affecting the domestic institutions of the States themselves. Your committee will not dwell upon the picture that is thus presented to their minds. The reflection it excites is one of mingled bitterness and horror. It is one, they trust, which is never to be realized. Looking upon their beloved country, as it now stands, the envy and admiration of the world; contemplating as they do, that unrivalled constitution, by which a beauteous family of confederated States, each independent in its own separate sphere, revolve around a Federal head with all the harmony and regularity of the planetary system; and knowing as they do, that under the beneficent influence of our free institutions, the people of this country enjoy a degree of liberty, prosperity and happiness, not only unpossessed, but scarcely imagined by any other upon earth; they cannot and will not advert to the horrors, or depict the consequences of that most awful day, when the sun of American freedom shall go down in blood, and nothing remain of this glorious Republic but the bleeding, scattered, and dishonored fragments. It would, indeed, be the extinction of the world's last hope, and the jubilee of tyranny over all the earth!

But your committee feel, that with these painful impressions on their minds, they would but imperfectly discharge their duty if they did not make an earnest appeal to the patriotism of the American People to sustain the resolution adopted by the House. And they would also appeal to the good sense and good feelings of that portion of the abolitionists, who, acting under a mistaken sense of moral and religious duty, have embarked in this crusade against the South, solemnly invoking them, in the name of our common country, to abstain from a system of agitation which has not only failed, and will always fail, to attain its objects, but has even brought the Union itself into a state of imminent and fearful peril. It is confidently believed that this appeal will not be made in vain, and that hereafter all who truly love their country will manifest their patriotism by avoiding this unhappy cause of discord and disunion, and that they will make no further exertions upon a subject, from the continued agitation of which nothing but augmented evils can result.

Your committee conclude by reporting the following resolutions, conformably to the instructions given them by the House:

Resolved, That Congress possesses no constitutional authority to interfere in any way with the institution of slavery in any of the States of this Confederacy.

Resolved, That Congress ought not to interfere in any way with slavery in the District of Columbia.

And whereas it is extremely important and desirable, that the agitation of this subject should be finally arrested, for the purpose of restoring tranquillity to the public mind, your committee respectfully recommend the adoption of the following additional resolution, viz:

Resolved, That all petitions, memorials, resolutions, propositions, or papers, relating in any way or to any extent whatever, to the subject of slavery, or the abolition of slavery, shall, without either being printed or referred, be laid upon the table, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon.

[These resolutions were adopted by the House on Thursday, May 26th.]

---

* Laws District of Columbia, p. 50.
† Laws District of Columbia, p. 64.
‡ Laws United States, vol. ii. p. 113.
‖ Journals of the Old Congress, vol. iv. p. 288.
§ Journals of the Old Congress, p. 299.
¶ Article 1, section 8.
** Amendments to the Constitution, art. 5.
†† Dallas's Rep. vol. 3, p. 388.
‡‡ Con. art. 1, sec. 8.
‖‖ Art. 4, sec. 4.

N. E. A. S. CONVENTION.

Resolutions were offered, and sustained by Mr. May, Mr. Thurston from Winthrop, Me., Mr. Stanton, of Ohio, Mr. Milligan of Vermont, and Mr. Wright, (colored) of New-York. Interesting and thrilling and eloquent as were the preceding speakers, I could have said to Mr. Wright, 'Thou excellest them all!' It was a colored man pleading for his colored brethren and sisters in insufferable bondage,—two millions and a half of people, with whom he is identified! Shame on those who talk of the inferiority of the colored man! Let such listen for once to the eloquence of Mr. Wright—let them hear *him* expatiate on the wretched condition of his people, and certainly *our* brethren likewise, and see if they can have no feeling for the slave! Such eloquence of the heart cannot fail to reach the heart that is not utterly callous to all the feelings of humanity. Mr. Wright was full of gratitude for what had been done in the cause of emancipation. He thanked God that so much has been accomplished, without the shedding of blood—that no lives had been lost in the cause.—He had full faith that slavery would be abolished—he *knew* it would be abolished—and, said he, 'we are trying to obtain moral and intellectual worth.' Some of the abolitionists might fall, might become martyrs in the cause, but if they should, they would die in a glorious cause—their spirits would ascend to God, and their blood like the blood of the martyrs of old, would be the seed of the church.—*Herald of Freedom.*

Rev. Theodore S. Wright, a colored Presbyterian clergyman from the city of New York, spoke at some length. His remarks were eloquent and full of gratitude towards his abolition friends.—Slavery he said must perish. It stood before the car of the Millennium, and it must be swept away. A jubilee for his oppressed brethren was drawing near—with the eye of faith he could see it—the degraded and imbruted, were to be raised ere long to the dignity of men. He knew the struggle would be a fearful one—he knew how much the friends of the black man were called upon to suffer. Like the primitive christians they had been tried in the fire of persecution. Their property had been destroyed—their names cast out as evil—their very lives put in peril. But life had not been taken. Glory to God in the highest, the friends of the slave yet lived to accomplish their work. And, though the craftsmen of Diana rage—though Paul be beaten with rods—though 'the city be in an uproar,' yet he believed that the cause of Emancipation would go on until the two millions and a half of American Slaves with whom he was in some measure identified, should enjoy the liberty which God had intended for all His children.

The Aristocracy who last fall failed to defeat the meeting of thirty or forty ladies, did not venture to assail an assembly of *five hundred* delegates from the interior of New England—assembled in the Puritan city, and in the vicinity of Liberty's cradle—to maintain the republican principles of their fathers—principles which foreign despots and American slaveholders only fear—but which the *people*—the abused and down trodden of all colors and climes, reverence and love. —*Haverhill Gazette.*

THE SLAVE-TRADE.

On Wednesday His Majesty's brig Gannet, arrived off this port, bringing in the 'Creole,' a Portuguese slaver, with 307 Africans on board, chiefly children; they were captured off St. Domingo, and had been out 25 days. They had not suffered so much as those in the Vigilante, although, dysentery had broken out among them. The Creole is a fine vessel, and is said to sail fast. The Africans are from Congo and other districts in the vicinity of Sierra Leone; one girl who speaks English is from that place. A man and his son who speaks English, say that they had resided in the colony of the Cape of Good Hope, and having gone beyond the frontiers, were taken and sold where the whole have been landed.

The Africans from the Vigilant are recovering; they are chiefly Eboes, and have suffered severaly from ophthalmia and eruptions. The slave deck in the Creole (the Vigilant had none) did not exceed two feet in height; the men were all manacled and crowded in the usual manner, so if they had experienced bad weather, or a long detention on board, many more deaths must have occurred. These African races are chiefly cultivators of rice and other provisions: they are intelligent and industrious. The Gannet sailed for Barbadoes without entering the port, having communicated with His Excellency the Lieutenant-Governor.—*Bahama Argus.*

Another Slaver Captured.—A Bermuda paper of March 29th states His Brittanic Majesty's ship Champion captured on the 3d ult. the slave brig Reconiarti, pierced for 16 guns. The Reconiarti, after a long chase, during which her guns, anchors, boats, etc. were thrown overboard, was run on shore on the east end of Cuba, and 280 of her slaves forced on shore; 30, principally women, were drowned, in attempting to land. The brig was, however, got off, and with 188 slaves taken into Havana.

Slaves on the Coast of Africa.—Capt. Bryant, of ship Sea Mew, arrived at Portland, on Tuesday, in 50 days from the West Coast of Africa, states that a British man-of-war had arrived on the coast, having taken about twenty Spanish slavers, the crews of which, to the amount of about four hundred, had been landed at Prince's and St. Thomas's Islands, where they were dying daily for want of provisions, and begging for food and a passage from the Island.

SHAME OF SLAVEHOLDERS!

Mart for Negroes.—We understand that a proposition is before the City Council, relative to the establishment of a mart for the sale of negroes in this City, in a place more remote from observation, and less offensive to the public eye than the one now used for that purpose. The North East corner of the Exchange or Custom House, one of the most frequented parts of our City, is certainly rendered quit a nuisance, by being made the noisy and otherwise offensive theatre of this kind of traffic. We doubt not that the proposition before the Council will be acceptable to the community, and that it may be so matured as to promote public decency, without prejudic to the interest of individuals.—*Charleston Courier.*

COMMUNICATIONS.

ANNIVERSARY MEETING OF THE AMERICAN UNION.

The Society met on Wednesday, May 25, at the Tremont Hall, Hon W. Reed of Marblehead, in the Chair.

The meeting was opened with prayer by Rev. J. H. Church, who offered thanks that we were members of this highly favored nation, in which God was now doing so much for the improvement of the human race. Mention was made of the evils of slavery, particularly of the evils of the African slave-trade. Thanks were then offered that God had raised up so many friends to the African race. Particular thanks were then offered for the American Colonization Society and the American Union, and the blessing of God was desired for all efforts in behalf of that race, provided they were carried on in a judicious manner, and in a Christian spirit.

The Report was then read. As it was long, and was ordered to be printed and circulated, we will merely mention, that it appeared that the Society had not yet been able to obtain a proper agent, and that they regretted this the less, as owing to the excitement which had prevailed the past year, little could have been executed by him in behalf of the objects of the Society. [We are afraid that the faith and patience of the Society has been more increased than that of the public.]

Rev. H. Winslow presented the first resolution. We will not pretend to give the words of it, as like the other resolution it was read but once. They will doubtless be published in due time in the Recorder. The speech of Mr. Winslow consisted entirely of a most sensible and excellent argument in favor of the opinion, that the degraded intellect of the negro race, and its manifestation in the head and in the face, have been wholly produced by temporary circumstances. He stated, and there is no doubt of its truth, that the exercise of the animal propensities, and the neglect of the intellectual, and the same vice versa, produce a great alteration in the shape of the face and the head, and even in the individual. [We believe that every form of the skull often changes in a few years in the individual after arriving at manhood, from causes of this kind, and that mind makes even the external man, in a great degree.] Much more, he said, does this take place in the course of many generations—that white races, even our own forefathers in the barbarian state, manifest the effect of these causes as plainly as the negro race—that the history of the negro race in the North of Africa, proves beyond doubt that they have attained, and can attain an equal elevation of intellect and character with the whites—that color is produced gradually by climate. [We think this is not true; all analogy teaches us that the striking variations in the color of the human races were produced immediately, and were thence continued to the present time, in spite of climate.] Mr. W. spoke a few words of the abolitionists without bitterness or sneering—said he wished them success, and approved of much they had done. It was well known he thought them a little *ultra* and *radical* in some particulars.

The meeting was then adjourned to the forenoon of the next day; when Mr. Rogers of the Odeon presented a resolution, in nearly the following words:

Resolved, That we ought to continue our efforts until slavery is wholly abolished.

Mr. Rogers said, that there had been much agitation on this subject, but scarcely any discussion; that it was intolerable that foreigners should come over here, [missionaries to the western celestial empire, we suppose,] to teach *us* the nature of *our own* institutions—that the interference of foreigners was most dangerous, tending directly to make us quarrel with each other, to destroy the constitution, and fill the country with insurrection and blood.—Suppose we should go to England, and teach there that tythes were robbery, and call all who supported the system robbers and murderers, and that submission to tythes was nothing less than slavery?

He said that slavery, as to the evils which result from it, was milder in America than in any other part of the world, and was here most overruled for good; still the evil was second to none in our country; [not even to that of the abolitionists?] Abroad, it has the garb of hell, particularly in Africa. He described, in glowing terms, the horrors of the slave-trade in Africa, and of the middle passage—alluded to its effect at the South; the worst was the oppression of the mind, making brutes of men. Christians should aim to abolish it as far and as fast as they may—that exasperated public opinion will never do it—it will only make midnight murders—that we were now probably farther than ever from abolition—that abolition must all be done through the master—that the prospect of abolition was now most gloomy at the north and the south—that agitation had ever created division in the Church at the north—that there was no prospect of union in the Church on this subject. In some things we were divided even in principle. On the subject of the rights of the slave, the good of the whole was the supreme law; [Paley?] that by this law, the slave had a right to liberty sometime, as a child had a right to liberty when arrived at manhood. That the division of opinions and measures was widening, and may divide the corner-stone of the church. [What did the speaker mean in this connection by the corner-stone of the church? We thought the corner-stone always meant Christ. The church, his body, is already cut into innumerable sects, and the mangled and bleeding parts still try to remove farther from each other—to preserve their power to do good!] Mr. Rogers said that light and love were the only means by which slavery must be abolished; that we must utterly refrain from calling hard names, and using harsh expressions. [How unfortunate that the beloved and loving disciple should have been left to call him that hated his brother a murderer.] He said that the South will divide the Union in defence of their institutions, &c. &c.; that we have now little to do but to wait for the abatement of the deluge of excitement—but that he feared the soil that would emerge would more resemble lava, requiring generations to pass before the scorched surface could be covered with the first beginnings of vegetation.

Rev. Nehemiah Adams then introduced numerous resolutions, to which he spoke at considerable length. We must wholly defer any notice of these, until the next number of the Liberator.

Rev. Joseph Tracy then introduced a resolution, branding as infamous the designs which some entertained of introducing slavery into Texas. He read the Proclamation of Gov. Burnett, in which he said, the honor was permitted alone to our United States to be the slave coast for Texas. He wished to know which was worst, to buy slaves for Texas of King Peter on the African coast, or to buy them of Peter King of Alabama, on the American coast? He said that such conduct really moved his indignation, which was indeed manifest in his countenance, in spite of his endeavor to suppress it—and we believe that besides the word infamous, he actually used the word piratical. We hope brother Tracy will be more prudent in future, as such hard names cannot but have the worst effects.

In the next No. we will conclude this sketch.

A FRIEND OF THE AMERICAN UNION.

COMMUNION WITH SLAVITES.

Among the business which was transacted at the New England Anti-Slavery Convention of 1836, no subject seemed to me to be of so much importance, as the resolution adopted at the Thursday meeting, by which the principles adopted by the Presbytery of Chillicothe were formally approved by that Convention. Nothing is more obvious to all persons who are acquainted with the situation of slavery in the Southern States, than the fact, that all attempts to mitigate the horrors of slavery, much less to extirpate its predominance, will be utterly unavailing, until the church is purified from that abomination. I was in New York during the anniversaries, and was astonished that the principal religious societies still continue to tolerate the *nuisance* of introducing hardened slaveholders to 'speechify' on these occasions. I know many persons who will not attend those assemblies on that account. There is one man in particular, whose admission to the platform, in connection with other circumstances, is an insult to the Christian community, as well as to common sense.

Mr. Plummer, of Virginia, bawls aloud for the dissemination of Tracts, Bibles, the volume distribution, and many other good things—and at the same time is now and always has been exerting every effort in his power to detain in impotence and darkness all the colored people in the Southern States. He knows that every effort to meliorate the condition of the white people will be futile, until Slavery is abolished. He knows that no man dares to preach the Gospel at the South—he may proclaim a part of it—but he must not publish the whole, and, above all, he must not preach just that part which is most applicable, and therefore most necessary. He may talk about crimes of a certain character and quality; but he dare not reveal the complicated crimes which are amalgamated with the whole frame work of society; and without which in its present state it could not exist.

For example—the Minister knows that his Elders are cruel slave drivers—dare he expostulate with them upon the subject? He would have the retort—'Mind your own business, and not interfere with my Negroes.' The Minister knows that his Member is a regular Cultivator and Trafficker of Slaves; dare he admonish him not to live in adultery or fornication, and not to sell his own children? Not at all—he dare not open his mouth—as Mr. Bethune well said at the Colonization meeting in New York, he is dumb as the ass, before her mouth was miraculously taught to reprove the obstinate, stupid Balaam. In fact, nothing will efficiently promote the great cause of piety and truth, except the purification of the Sanctuary; and the resolutions which have been adopted by the New England Anti-Slavery Convention are well adapted to secure the final triumph of the great and holy cause of liberty and religion.

The peculiar obstacle to the progress of truth upon the subject of slavery in the Southern States consists in the fact, that all the christian denominations are composed of slaveholders, who are not less deeply concerned in the prolongation of the system, and equally interested in its unholy gains as any other class of the citizens. From that most ungodly amalgamation of a profession of christianity with the practice of kidnapping, the church must be severed by peaceable means, or he who has left the churches in Asia in desolation, unless the slaveholders repent, will remove their candlestick out of its place. It is devoutly to be hoped that the resolution which was so unanimously adopted by the Convention will be not less derisively enforced. WATCHMAN.

BOSTON:

SATURDAY, JUNE 4, 1836.

GEORGE THOMPSON IN ENGLAND.

If we have ceased to marvel at the misrepresentations, the predictions, and the assaults of the enemies of the anti-slavery cause, we are still compelled to be wonder-struck at the callous effrontery and brazen self-possession which they manifest whenever their prophecies fail, or their falsehoods are exposed, or their violence returns upon their own heads.

For example—They boldly proclaimed that Mr. THOMPSON was a fugitive from justice, and had to leave England to escape being sent to Botany Bay!! They had scarcely finished their proclamation, before Mr. T. returned to his native land—but they expressed no surprise that, under such circumstances, he should return thither! O no! On his arrival in England, he was received with every demonstration of esteem and respect, in the most public manner, by some of the noblest men and women in the kingdom, and is now riding upon the topmost wave of popularity. Yet his enemies are not at all disappointed at his treatment, but regard it as a matter of course!—Yes, 'the scoundrel,' 'the felon,' is received with open arms by such men as Wardlaw, Heugh and James, and no astonishment is visible upon any pro-slavery countenance in our land!

Several numbers of the Glasgow Chronicle, as late as 22d April, are on our table, all of them containing reports of Mr. Thompson's interesting and eloquent lectures upon slavery in the United States, and also upon the kindred topics of Temperance, Peace, and the Missionary Enterprise. These we shall lay before our readers as early as practicable. As a specimen of the boldness and severity of his attack upon the war system in England, we quote the following sentences from his lecture before the Society for the promotion of permanent and universal Peace, delivered at Newcastle-upon-Tyne:

'He (Mr. T.) carried his Peace principles to the fullest possible extent. He considered war unlawful, under all possible, all conceivable circumstances. (Applause.) He confessed, that in looking over the face of his beloved country, he could not join with those who called it *a christian country*. In every direction, he saw the paraphernalia of war, offensive and defensive. Our history was a history of bloody wars. The demon of desolation had deprived us of £400,000,000 sterling of treasure, and 200,000,000 of our sons. Call us a nation of civilised *savages*, of wholesale *butchers*, of sanguinary, unappeasable *murderers*—but call us not a nation of *Christians*, till we have more consistently exemplified the doctrines of the Prince of Peace!'

It does not appear that Mr. Thompson was either pelted with rotten eggs, or tarred and feathered, for this 'treasonable' language against the war system, although the people of England are almost as much attached to that system as we in this country are to slavery.

At the Second Annual Meeting of the Glasgow Emancipation Society, which was held in Dr. Heugh's Chapel March 1st, Dr. Wardlaw in the Chair—several resolutions were adopted respecting slavery in the United States, which we shall publish hereafter. The Society 'agreed to request the continuance of Mr. Thompson's invaluable labors, by visiting the chief towns of Britain and Ireland, and delivering addresses on those topics, of such momentous interest to both countries.'

The following Honorary and Corresponding Members of the Society were unanimously elected:

George Thompson, Esq.
Wm. Lloyd Garrison, Boston, N. England.
Arthur Tappan, Esq. New York.
M. George Washington Lafayette, } Paris.
M. Victor de Tracey, }
Rev. Thomas Roberts, Bristol.
Daniel O'Connell, Esq. M. P.
Joseph Sturge, Esq. Birmingham.
Rev. Nathaniel Paul, of Wilberforce Settlement, Upper Canada.

The many favorable notices which are made in England and Scotland, of our humble labors in the anti-slavery cause, are in one sense delightful, because we know they emanate from noble and disinterested minds—and painful, because they are exaggerated far, very far beyond our deserts. Ah! how much more valuable is the approbation of the wise and good among mankind, than are the applauses and honors of an oppressive nation!

Below, we give another highly important and interesting letter from Mr. Thompson. The resolutions contained in it, adopted by the delegates of the United Secession Church of Scotland, cannot fail to command attention, and to produce a strong impression upon certain religious bodies in this country. These are to be followed by an address to American Christians, by the same Church. It is evident that religious professors in America must give up slavery, and come out from the unclean thing, or be regarded with abhorrence by the Christians of other lands. We trust these resolutions will be extensively published in our land.

LETTER FROM GEORGE THOMPSON.

GLASGOW, April 29, 1836.

TO W. L. GARRISON:

MY DEAR FRIEND,—I have but a few moments to write you by the present packet—I am, besides, suffering in my health, and deeply engaged in home affairs. I must not, however, fail to inform you, that there has been a very important movement in the Synod (an Ecclesiastical Court, corresponding to the General Assembly) of the United Secession Church of Scotland. The meeting of this large and important body took place last week in Edinburgh. On the 20th, the Synod entered on the subject of Slavery in America. Overtures were read from different Presbyteries, proposing that the Synod should address the Churches in the United States, with whom the Synod is in correspondence. The Synod unanimously approved of the overtures, and, after some deliberation, it was moved—'That the Synod shall appoint a Committee to prepare a draft of an affectionate, respectful, and faithful address to the Christian Churches in the United States of America, in reference to the evils of Negro Slavery, and of the prejudices against Color, as these exist in the United States; and the obligations under which Christians are placed to adopt immediate measures for the emancipation of this long oppressed class of their fellow countrymen.' This resolution the Synod *unanimously* adopted, and Drs. Pringle, Heugh, Brown, Mitchell, &c. were appointed a Committee to prepare a draft of said address. After the above business, and in compliance with a request preferred by the Moderator on behalf of the Synod, I addressed the Court and a large audience for about two hours. I was heard with the deepest attention, and at the conclusion was presented by the Moderator with the unanimous thanks of the Synod. The Committee appointed above was instructed to prepare resolutions in reference to American Slavery, and submit them to the Synod for adoption. On the 26th, the following resolutions were unanimously adopted by the Synod, and with the Address will be forwarded without delay to the Christian Churches of America.

1st. That we hold, as one of 'those things that are most surely believed among us,' that the treating of human beings as property without an express permission from Him who is the Supreme Proprietor, is utterly repugnant to the principles both of Reason and Revelation—equally inconsistent with the law of Justice and Love—an outrage on human nature, and an insult to God its Author.

2d. That believing that 'God hath made of one blood all the nations of men to dwell on the face of the earth,' and that 'in Christ Jesus' all believers are in relation and character and privilege 'one,' without respect to distinction of *color*, any more than of origin or sex or age or station, we maintain that all men, yielding obedience to the laws of civil society, have an equal right to the secure enjoyment of life, liberty, and property—that all Christians, yielding obedience to the laws of Christ, are equally entitled to the joint participation of all the ordinances appointed for the members of the Church—and that it is the duty of the followers of Jesus to 'honor all men,' and to 'love the brotherhood,' and to express these sentiments by a corresponding conduct.

3rd. That we contemplate, with deep sorrow and regret, the enormous guilt which our own nation has contracted by the practices of holding and trading in Slaves, practices persisted in for a long course of years, notwithstanding the clearest exposition of their impiety, injustice, inhumanity and impolicy,—with devout wonder at the forbearance of God in not having shown his righteous indignation, by involving in common ruin those who perpetrated and those who permitted such enormous crimes—and with lively gratitude, first to God, and then to the benevolent men whom he honored as the instruments of his mercy, for those two great national measures, the legislative abolition of the British Slave Trade by declaring that traffic to be felonious, and the legislative Abolition of Slavery throughout the Colonies of Great Britain.

4th. That while we cherish a fraternal esteem and affection for Christians and Christian Churches, in every land—for 'all who in every place call on the name of the Lord Jesus, both theirs and ours'—we regard with peculiar interest the Christians and Christian Churches of the United States of America, not so much because many of these Christians are sprung from a common ancestry, and many of these Christian Churches hold not only the same doctrinal sentiments but maintain the same ecclesiastical polity with ourselves, as for their distinguished zeal, energy, and perseverance in 'works of faith and labors of love'—for the unprecedented exertions they are making for the universal and thorough christianization of their own country and of the world.

5th. That in proportion to the esteem and affection with which we regard the Christians and Christian Churches in the United States of America, are the astonishment and grief with which *we have heard*, that not only among the members, but even among the office bearers of some of these Churches, are to be found proprietors of, and dealers in slaves—that not only private individuals but some ecclesiastical bodies have engaged in a shocking, though, happily, hopeless attempt to reconcile these monstrous practices with the law of God and the Gospel of Jesus Christ,—and that to such an extent does the irrational and unchristian prejudice connected with these practices prevail, that, not merely in the ordinary intercourse of society, but even in the most sacred institutions of Religion, men of color are treated as if they belonged to an inferior species, acknowledged indeed to be fellow christians, yet dealt with as if they were not fellow men.

6th. That we greatly rejoice to know, that just sentiments on this subject are not only held by many individual Christians in the United States, but are clearly and forcibly expressed in the symbolical books of some of the Churches, and that there is a rapidly increasing conviction of the reality and magnitude of the evils specified, manifesting itself in vigorous exertions for their complete removal; and although sensible of the numerous and powerful obstacles which our Christian brethren, both in their political and ecclesiastical capacity, have to surmount in order to their success in this sacred enterprise, we confidently trust that by the blessing of God on the faithful statement of Christian truth, and the impartial exercise of Christian discipline, these unseemly stains on the fair character of American christianity will be wiped away, and so powerful an influence be exercised by a purified Church over the national mind as shall secure ere long the legislative abolition of Slavery throughout the whole territory of a people, the liberality of whose political institutions gives them so high a place among the nations, while it contrasts so strongly with the upholding and even with the permitting of Slavery and the Slave Trade; and hopefully anticipate that that degradation of character which is said to belong to men of color in the United States, and that contempt and dislike which have alternately been the cause and the effect of that degradation, will not long survive the dissolution of that unnatural state of society in which they both originate.

7th. That disclaiming, as fellow servants of a common Master, all disposition uncharitably to judge or magisterially to dictate—remembering that 'every man must give an account of himself unto God'—and hoping that our Christian brethren in America will not be backward either to receive or to return, when circumstances shall seem to require it, the kind office of faithful admonition—we are constrained by the love we bear our Lord, the regard we have for his authority, the jealousy we feel for the honor of his name, and the desire we feel for the prosperity of his cause, as well as by our cordial affection for brethren for whom 'we labor fervently in our prayers, that they may stand perfect and complete in all the will of God,' to strengthen their hands and encourage their hearts in the arduous but honorable work to which our Lord is now loudly calling them, by urging them by the regard we know they have for the authority of God, the grace of the Saviour, the honor of Christianity, and the salvation of the world, to employ the mighty influence which God has given them, and which brings along with it a corresponding weight of responsibility, in 'loosing the bands of wickedness, undoing the heavy burdens, letting the oppressed go free, taking away from the midst of them the yoke and the putting forth of the finger,' that so 'their light,' which has already 'gone forth as the morning, may shine more and more unto the perfect day.'

I am sure you will hail the above proceedings with delight. The Congregational Union of Scotland meets next week, and will, I trust, act upon the subject. Surely these expressions of principle and feeling will awaken the serious attention of the Southern Churches. If they do not quickly renounce the guilty system, they will be regarded with horror in every part of Protestant Christendom.

You shall hear from me more fully by the next packet.

Your loving friend,

GEO. THOMPSON.

P. S. You will, I am sure, rejoice to learn, that on Sunday last, the 24th inst. my dear wife presented me with a second *Son*, a very fine babe, who thrives well. Mrs. Thompson is recovering rapidly. She desires to be most kindly remembered to yourself, Mrs. Garrison, and all our friends in Boston. The boy will be named after you. May it please Heaven to spare him, and endue him with some portion at least of the spirit which animates my endeared friend, whose name he is to bear! G. T.

[☞ It seems by the foregoing, that Nature has combined with Friendship to make a very prompt return of affectionate respect on the part of our brother Thompson, for a token of esteem which we were enabled to present to him a short time since. Blessings on the head of the new comer!]—*Ed. Lib.*

ANTI-SLAVERY ADDRESSES. A correspondent at Woburn informs us, that Rev. S. J. May delivered an address in that village on Sabbath afternoon, in Rev. Mr. Bennett's meeting-house. The audience was large, notwithstanding the unpropitious state of the weather. The impression was decidedly good. 'His lecture was a thrilling appeal in behalf of suffering humanity, and bespoke a soul breathing out love to God, and benevolence towards all his creatures.'

The editor of the Lynn Record speaks in very favorable terms of an anti-slavery address delivered in that town on Friday evening last, by Rev. P. R. Russell, who seems never to be weary in well-doing. The meeting-house was entirely filled, and the speaker listened to with profound attention. The Record expresses a belief, that a majority of the clergymen of Lynn, as well as the people composing their societies respectively, profess to be friendly to the principles of anti-slavery. Blessings on that town!

ALL RIGHT. At the meeting of the N. E. Anti-Slavery Convention, four delegates were present by the name of *Wright*:—Rev. T. S. Wright, of New-York; Rev. H. C. Wright, of Boston; Rev. Luther Wright, of Woburn, and Elizur Wright, Jr. of N. Y. The anti-slavery cause is all right—the slaveholders and their apologists alone being in the wrong.

THE MODERATOR OF THE GENERAL ASSEMBLY of the Presbyterian church in the United States, in the year of our Lord 1836, is a SLAVEHOLDER!!!—*New-York Evangelist.*

☞ Elected, too, by ministers of the gospel! How truly applicable to each one of them who voted for this clerical oppressor, is the language of the Scriptures—'When thou sawest a thief, then thou consentedst with him,' and didst give him thy vote of approbation!

MEETING AT NEWBURYPORT.

We are very sorry to perceive, that our birth-place is still governed by a pro-slavery spirit, or, rather, by a few individuals who favor not God and regard not man. The Essex County Anti-Slavery Society held its annual meeting in Newburyport on Tuesday last. The committee of the Temple-street meeting-house had given permission to the Society to occupy it; but, on Monday afternoon, a few factious individuals belonging to the congregation called a meeting of the *parish*, not of the *proprietors*, and after a warm debate, by a vote of 45 to 38, decided that the Anti-Slavery Society should not be permitted to convene in that house! An excellent and spacious place, however, was procured as a substitute. Mr. CHARLES BUTLER, an estimable and spirited citizen, at some hazard to his property, promptly invited the delegates and the people to assemble in his garden, having procured seats for the audience, and erected a stage and an awning for the speakers. Four or five hundred persons were present. The place and the occasion produced a thrilling effect. The trump of liberty was made to echo and re-echo upon the free winds, which bore its spirit-stirring notes to heaven. The speakers were Charles Stuart, H. B. Stanton, C. C. Burleigh, Rev. T. S. Wright, of New York, Rev. H. C. Wright, Mr. Caples and Mr. Hilton, of Boston, William Oakes, Esq. of Ipswich, and Rev. Mr. Peckham, of New Hampshire. One of our brethren, who has attended all the great anti-slavery meetings in Massachusetts, declares that this was the most interesting one at which he had ever been present. No doubt the peculiar circumstances of the case served to heighten the effect. As Mr. Whittier was a delegate, we shall probably have some account of the meeting in the Haverhill Gazette of to-day.

MR. PINCKNEY'S REPORT. Perhaps some of our readers will groan at the length of this Report, but, having been adopted by the House of Representatives, it is of too much consequence as a public document not to find a place in our pages. To those who do not choose to read the whole of it, we would recommend to their attention the long paragraph, commencing in the 2d column of the preceding page, thus—'Your committee have already shown,' &c. to 'a violation of the public faith.' By the doctrine therein inculcated, a millstone is put by the committee about their own necks and the neck of the monster slavery: the argument is perfectly suicidal, and shows conclusively that justice requires the immediate emancipation of the slaves in the District of Columbia. The Report is weakness itself, exhibiting neither ingenuity nor ability; yet the foolish and infatuated Pinckney is led to suppose that it will induce even abolitionists from further meddling with the subject of slavery!! Why, we tell him, it shall be a 'firebrand' in our hands to light anew the flame of human sympathy and of public indignation.

DIED—In this city, on Friday, 20th ult., Miss Catherine E. daughter of Peter and Elizabeth Gray. Her sickness was of long duration, which she bore with marked fortitude, and great patience. Truly it may be said of her, that she was a youth of great promise, highly respected and deeply lamented by her numerous friends and associates, to whom her amiableness had greatly endeared her. Her death has clothed her parents in the sad garment of affliction.

NOTICE.

By leave of Providence, a special meeting of the Boston Female Anti-Slavery Society will be held on Tuesday next, June 7, at Congress Hall, corner of Congress and Milk-streets, at 3 1-2 P. M. Addresses are expected from Mr. HENRY B. STANTON and several other gentlemen.

Ladies and gentlemen are respectfully invited to attend. By order of the Board,

June 3, 1836. M. V. BALL, Rec. Sec.

NOTICE.

The members of the Boston Philomathean Society are requested to attend their regular monthly meeting, to be held in the Centre-street Chapel on Monday, the 6th inst. at 1-2 past 7, P. M.

By order of the Prefect,

June 1, 1836. W. S. JENNINGS.

PORTRAIT OF MR. GARRISON.

THE subscriber has published a Portrait of MR. GARRISON, engraved on steel by Sartain, from a picture by himself, copies of which may be obtained at 46, Washington-street, Boston—at the Anti-Slavery Office, New York—and of Mr. Benjamin C. Bacon, Philadelphia. Price one dollar each, which is but one third the usual price for such engravings. The engraving is large, and done in the best English style of mezzo tint, and is a faithful copy from the picture, which has been pronounced by the most intimate friends of Mr. GARRISON a very perfect likeness, in which opinion, the subscriber is happy to say, Mr. G. himself coincides. So pleased was Mr. THOMPSON with this picture, that a copy was made at his request, and taken with him to England. M. C. TORREY.

LITERARY.

[For the Liberator.]

LINES

Written on the return of Mr. Garrison to Boston after the Mob of Oct. 21st, 1835.

Welcome to thee, thou injured one, the struggle o'er—for now
A brighter laurel trembling waits to deck thy tranquil brow!
A towering arch is reared aloft, and o'er it freely wave
The offerings of a grateful heart—the chained but joyous slave.
See, in his altered features, how conflicting feelings vie,
While silently the tear of love steals from his sunken eye!
No burning thoughts of dark revenge are rankling in his breast,
But peacefully and patiently he waits his God's behest—
'Let *now* my suffering people go, that they their God may serve:
Nor from this mandate, long delayed, will I, th' Almighty, swerve.'
Fair Freedom dropt a burning tear, and blushing, hung her head,
To see thee dragged by ruffian hands, and like a felon led
O'er ground ensanguined with the blood our fathers shed of yore,
And hallowed by th' immortal name our country's father bore! *
And Bunker's heights looked frowning on, and the walls of Faneuil shook,
And rumbling went a hollow moan through every lane and nook,
When answering to the war-trump's note the cannon thundering roared,
As dimly seen through smoke and dust 'the red artillery' poured.
The sheen of the warrior's crested helm is dimmed with orphan's tears,
And wildly round his sleepless couch the widow's shrieks he hears;
But the joyous songs of ransomed ones shall burst upon thy ear,
As unto heaven in thankfulness their toil-worn arms they rear:
And their merry songs in nightly sport shall disturb thy calm repose,
When the dews descend to catch the breath of the fragrant briar rose:
And the stars shall fade, and the moon shall wane, e'en the sun his glory miss,
But thou shalt joy to plume thy wings, and soar to immortal bliss.

CONRAD.

* A mob in Boston! The birth-place of the revolution—the cradle of liberty! A mob in WASHINGTON (!) St., Boston, to put down free discussion!—*Mr. Thompson's Letter to the editor of the Liberator.*

[For the Liberator.]

INVOCATION.

O! boast no more of *Freedom*,
My country! boast not thou,
While this dark stain is resting
Upon thy sullied brow:
Say not, that, as the eagle,
The wild-winds, thou art free:
While round thee are unsevered
The chains of *Slavery!*

Boast not thy institutions,
Reared for the seeking mind—
To all alike are equal,
To *classes* unconfined:
While millions of thy children,
'Neath ignorance's pall,
Are by *thy* voice, forbidden
To break from error's thrall!

Ah! no: thy fame is fading:
Thy laurels now no more,
Breathe pure and grateful perfume,
To earth's remotest shore.
Thy fame—thy *honor* 's fading:
Arise! while yet 'tis day;
Rise! from thy sinful slumber,
And cast those chains away!

O! let not USURPATION,
More dread than Slavery's frown,
Beneath its waves of vengeance,
Thy sin—thy life-blood drown;
But rise *thyself* in glory,
In holy freedom's pride,
(Roused by the call of justice,)
And cast those chains aside!

A——a.

[From the N. Y. Evangelist.]

TOBACCO.

What makes my teeth from day to day,
Exhibit symptoms of decay,
With pain and anguish rot away?
Tobacco!

What makes my breath so fœtid, foul?
What makes the ladies on me scowl,
And shun me as they would an owl?
Tobacco!

What makes me, when I'm called to speak,
Fly quick for fear my mouth will leak,
The spit-box or the door to seek?
Tobacco!

What is the cause of war and strife,
Between the good man and his wife,
Embittering every hour of life?
Tobacco!

What makes an appetite for rum,
And sends the drunkard staggering home,
And prematurely seals his doom?
Tobacco!

These are the facts, then let us shun
That weed that many has undone,
And our just vengeance wreak upon
Tobacco!

[From Zion's Advocate.]

PRAYER FOR THE SLAVE.

God of the helpless—Friend
Of those who bleed in wo;
To Thee, to Thee we send
Our supplication now.

Hear from thy throne on high—
O, hear and send relief—
Look with propitious eye
Upon the black man's grief.

In thraldom's chain he pines,
Degraded and oppress'd;
No light within him shines,
Nor joy upheaves his breast.

For him, for him we pray,
And thy good-will bespeak;
O, let a happier day
Upon his eye-lids break.

Let light and love abound—
The whites their duty see—
And haste with joy profound,
The day of jubilee.

ALPHONSO.

MISCELLANEOUS.

[From the Independent Press.]

MR. GARRISON'S LETTER

To the Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society of Philadelphia.

BOSTON, April 20, 1836.

Esteemed Friend:—I must appear by proxy at the first annual meeting of the Young Men's Anti-Slavery Society of your city. This letter shall refute the doctrine of materialists, who affirm, that there is no such entity as a spiritual substance, but that mind is matter, and matter is mind. Of this I am sure, that, during the thirty years of my life, I have never been able to locate my *body* in two places—in Boston and Philadelphia—at the same time; but I have found no difficulty in letting my *mind* range here, there, every where, below all depths, and above all heights, among things terrestrial and things celestial, in the twinkling of an eye. Human thoughts and opinions may ultimately possess an earthly omnipresence.

The first public lecture I ever delivered against American slavery, was in the hall of the Franklin Institute, in Philadelphia, which I was kindly permitted to occupy three evenings gratuitously. It was immediately after my liberation at Baltimore, in 1830. My auditors were chiefly members of the Society of Friends. My lectures were full of burning rebuke, 'hard language,' and earnest expostulation, and assuredly were quite as fanatical and incendiary as any thing I have since written or spoken; yet they were handsomely lauded by Mr. Morris, of the Inquirer, who has since been so zealous both in reprobating my sentiments, and assailing the anti-slavery cause. Was he right then, or is he wrong now?

Since that time, a change has come over our land. Other sentiments have become popular, new doctrines have been asserted, new estimates made of men and things, full of novel atrocity and absurd impiety. *Then* slavery, if it found some apologists, could find none to defend it as a righteous system; *now* it is widely vindicated in the Senate chamber, from the pulpit, by ecclesiastical bodies, by theological institutions, by the unanimous assent of legislative assemblies, as a system consistent with Christianity, and sanctioned by the Almighty. *Then* it was not disreputable, at least not dangerous, to express abhorrence of the practice of making merchandise of our fellow creatures; *now* he who remonstrates against that practice, is in peril of losing his property, safety, liberty and life.

When Jesus Christ forewarned his apostles, that they should be hated of all men for his name's sake, he sustained their spirits by the victorious promise, 'He that endureth to the end shall be saved.' And truly did he say—'It is enough for the disciple that he be as his master, and the servant as his lord: if they have called the master of the house Beelzebub, how much more shall they call them of his household?' So we may pertinently make the inquiry—If our enemies assert that slavery is a divine institution, 'the corner-stone of our republican edifice'—if they call cruelty humanity, lewdness virtue, fraud honesty, physical coercion voluntary labor, oppression disinterested benevolence; if they call latent animosity in the breasts of their victims palpable and sincere attachment, the prostration of millions of intellects the extreme exaltation of genius and knowledge, the ruin of the soul its sure preservation, the circulation of the Bible a criminal offence, the sanctity of marriage an idle conceit—what, as consistent errorists, ought they to call us, who scout their principles and hate their works? Why, fanatics, incendiaries, madmen, disturbers of the peace, to be sure—by those reproachful terms which they are heaping so liberally upon us. If they should call us honest men, discreet citizens, sound republicans, and genuine Christians, it would almost necessarily follow that we are as knavish, fanatical, oppressive and corrupt as themselves. In their vocabulary for 'treason' see 'loyalty,' for 'insanity' see 'reason,' for 'blood-thirstiness' see 'non-resistance,' for 'malignity' see 'forgiveness.' The history of eighteen hundred years exactly verifies the declaration of the great Captain of our salvation—'If ye were of the world, the world would love his own; but because ye are not of the world, but I have chosen you out of the world, therefore the world hateth you.' Let us not be alarmed about our reputation: let us rather rejoice that its inherent value is made manifest by the combined slander and scorn of all the wicked in our land. To reign with Christ, we must be crucified to the world; to save our lives, we must lose them; to preserve and enlarge our reputation, we must sacrifice it for righteousness' sake. As our beloved coadjutor George Thompson once pleasantly remarked: 'When we shall have succeeded in demolishing the great prison-house of oppression, each of us will be able to dig up for himself, out of its ruins, a very good reputation.' The time is swiftly approaching, when those hypocrites and time servers, who are now so voluble and flippant in denouncing our principles and measures, will be ambitious to drag over us the foul slime of their panegyric, and to cover us with the nauseous spittal of their sycophancy. We may bear their abuse, but not their praise, with complacency.

There is now another deadly foe besides slavery to be vanquished—it is MOBOCRACY. We are crushed to the earth, as freemen, by ten thousand tyrants instead of one. Fisher Ames most forcibly observes—'The rage of one man will be tired by repetition of outrage, or it may be eluded by art or by flight. It seldom smites the obscure, who are many, but like a gust, uproots chiefly the great trees that overtop the forest. A mobocracy, however, is always usurped by the worst men in the most corrupt times; in a period of violence by the most violent. It is a Briareus with a thousand hands, each bearing a dagger; a Cerberus, gaping with ten thousand throats, all parched and thirsting for fresh blood. It is a genuine tyranny, but of all the least durable, yet the most destructive while it lasts. The power of a despot, like the ardor of a summer's sun, dries up the grass, but the roots remain fresh in the soil; a mob government, like a West India hurricane, strews the fruitful earth with promiscuous ruins, and turns the sky yellow with pestilence. Men inhale a vapor like the Sirocco, and die in the open air for want of respiration. It is a winged curse that envelops the obscure as well as the distinguished, and is wafted into the lurking places of the fugitives. It is not doing justice to licentiousness, to compare it to a wind which ravages the surface of the earth; it is an earthquake that loosens its foundations, burying in an hour the accumulated wealth and wisdom of ages. Those who, after the calamity, would reconstruct the edifice of public liberty, will be scarcely able to find the model of the artificers, or even the ruins. Mountains have split and filled the fertile valleys, covering them with rocks and gravel; rivers have changed their beds; populous towns have sunk, leaving only frightful chasms, out of which are creeping the remnant of living wretches, the monuments and the victims of despair.'

At present, the master-spirits of misrule in our land are allowing us a temporary respite. But their malice is still deadly. 'Like salamanders, they can breathe only in fire. Like toads, they suck no aliment from the earth but its poisons. When they rest in their lurking places, it is like serpents in winter, the better to concoct their venom; and when they are in action, it is to shed it.' But, blessed be God, we have that which shall bruize the serpent's head.

'If,' says Mr. Ames, 'in the nature of things, there could be any experience which would be extensively instructive but our own, all history lies open for our warning, *open like a churchyard*, all whose lessons are solemn, and chiseled for eternity in the hard stone, lessons that whisper (O! that they could thunder) to republics—"Your passions forbid you to be free!"' Shall we then despair of our country? Never. For if religion and freedom cannot conquer and possess a speck of this earth, how shall we hope for the rescue and enfranchisement of the whole human race? Through Christ who strengthens them, his followers can do all things. Yours, truly,

WM. LLOYD GARRISON.

WM. H. SCOTT.

CONGRESS.

In the House, the slavery resolutions of Mr. Pinckney being under consideration,

Mr. Granger's name being called, he rose and said: 'I decline voting on the second resolution, on the ground that it is not in conformity with the instructions to the committee.'

[Loud cries of 'Order, order.']

The Chair said the gentleman had a right to ask to be excused.

Mr. Granger. I do not ask to be excused; I decline voting on the ground—

Here Mr. G. was peremptorily called to order by the Chair.

The question being next on the third resolution, it was read as follows:

'And whereas it is extremely important and desirable that the agitation of this subject should be finally arrested, for the purpose of restoring tranquility to the public mind, your committee respectfully recommend the adoption of the following additional resolution, viz:

'*Resolved*, That all petitions, memorials, resolutions, propositions, or papers, relating, in any way, or to any extent whatever, to the subject of slavery, or to the abolition of slavery, shall, without being either printed or referred, be laid upon the table, and that no further action whatever shall be had thereon.'

Mr. Phillips rose to a question of order, and proceeded to state that the resolution was not in conformity with the special instuction to the committee.

[Cries of 'Order, order.']

The Chair announced the special Order of the Day, it being 11 o'clock.

Mr. Pickney moved the suspension of the Rules for the purpose of proceeding in the consideration of the subject before the House.

The question being taken, it was decided in the affirmative—yeas 126.

So the Rules were suspended.

Mr. Phillips rose to a point of order, and submited a paper to the Chair, objecting to the right of the committee to report a third resolution.

The Chair said no question of order could arise upon the grounds of objection taken by the gentleman. The Chair had no control over the proceedings of the Committee; any question in regard to their jurisdiction must be settled by the House.

Mr. Phillips moved to lay the third resolution on the table; which motion, the Chair decided to be in order.

The question being taken by yeas and nays, it was decided in the negative—yeas 69, nays 118.

The question recurring on agreeing to the third resolution, it was taken, and the name of John Quincy Adams having been called,

Mr. Adams said the resolution was in direct violation of the Constitution of the U. S., and—

[Cries of 'Order, order,' drowned Mr. A's voice.]

The resolution was agreed to—yeas 117, nays 68.

Mr. Pinckney moved, under instructions of the select committee on abolition, that 5000 extra copies of the report and resolutions be printed.

The Chair stated that the motion must lie one day.

The Chair stated to the House that the questions of order which had arisen in the course of the consideration of the report and resolutions having been suspended, under a decision of the Chair, sustained by the House, until the decision of the House was ascertained on the resolutions, upon which the previous question had been ordered, were now in order, and subject to the disposition of the House.—He also stated that he had received written communications from two members, stating their views on certain points of order, which were also subject to the disposition of the House.

Mr. Glascock rose, and proceeded to give his reasons for asking to be excused from voting on the first resolutions.

Mr. Hawes called the gentleman to order, and reduced his point of order to writing.

The Chair decided that the gentleman could give his reasons in support of his motion to be excused.

After much confusion, and many motions and remarks and suggestions from different members,

The Chair said the question pending could be postponed or laid on the table, or the House could proceed to the Orders of the Day, leaving the question to be taken up at another time.

Mr. Wise appealed from this decision, and contended that the subject was before the House, and that it was not in order to proceed to the Orders of the Day. The question could not be considered as settled so long as a single member refused to vote upon it.

Mr. Glascock claimed the floor, and proceeded to give his reasons for declining to vote.

Mr. Vinton moved that the House proceed to the Orders of the Day.

The Chair having entertained the motion,

Mr. Robertson appealed from the decision of the Chair.

Mr. Mann of New-York, moved to lay the appeal on the table: which was agreed to.

The motion to proceed to the Orders of the Day was then agreed to without a count.

At a time when the House was quiet and calm, Mr. J. Q. Adams took the floor, and delivered one of those eloquent and effective speeches, for which he is unparalleled.

He was in favor of the resolution, and at an instant when we were unprepared for it, told us that a Mexican war, an Indian war, and a Negro war, within a twelvemonth might happen; nay he considered these events extremely probable—almost absolutely certain.

He said that the course of this country towards Texas would call out a Mexican war, and a Mexican war would be but a harbinger of a Negro and an Indian war. As for Texas, it could never be annexed to this country, without the consent of England, and if she did consent to its annexation to the United States, she would tell us, you must take the territory *untrammelled by slavery*. England would not consent to the existence of slavery in Texas. She would not allow its extension; and, added Mr. Adams, if you persist, she will wage a war against you, and your slaves will be freed. England has just set an example of her devotion to liberty in her own colonies, and if she engages in a war with you for emancipation, it will be the most popular war she has ever been engaged in.—He said, that if ever you take Texas into the family, you must also take the island of Cuba. He then went on to state some singular and startling facts in relation to our foreign affairs.—*Phila. Inquirer.*

A Mr. Seth Williams has recovered $140 damages, and about $300 costs, of the town of Cummington, for damage sustained by his team running off a bridge with an imperfect railing.

ANNUAL MEETING.

The following constitutes a portion of the proceedings of the American Anti-Slavery Society, at its annual meeting in New-York, last month:

The committee on the relations existing between the American and Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Societies presented the following, which was adopted:

The committee appointed to confer with the committee of the Massachusetts Anti-Slavery Society, with reference to the relation between that auxiliary and the parent society, have considered the subject and make the following report:

First—That the parent society relinquish its claim for certain sums pledged to it, and paid into the Treasury of the Massachusetts Society, under a belief, on the part of the pledgers, that they redeemed their pledges by making payment to the auxiliary, on condition that the Massachusetts Society pay the agents, &c., who have labored in the cause in that state, to the amount of the sums received by them as above-mentioned. And

Second—That in future all sums collected by the agents of the National Society in Massachusetts, or pledged to that society by residents in that state, be paid into the Treasury of the American Anti-Slavery Society, it being understood that the National Society will defray the expense of agents in Massachusetts the same as in other states. Respectfully submitted,

SAMUEL J. MAY, LEWIS TAPPAN,
HENRY C. WRIGHT, NATH'L COLVER,
WM. LLOYD GARRISON, JOHN RANKIN.

New York, May 11, 1836.

On motion of Gerrit Smith, Esq.,

Resolved, That this society earnestly and affectionately invites its members, and the members of its auxiliaries, diligently and prayerfully to examine the question, whether they can innocently make an ordinary use, or be concerned in the traffic of the productions of slave labor.

On motion of Robert Purvis,

Resolved, That we regard the remarkable and happy results of the experiment of Immediate Emancipation in those West India Islands, whose colonial legislature rejected the system of apprenticeship, as signal evidence of God's approbation of the measure, and as conclusive proof of the safety and policy of such emancipation.

On motion of Wm. Lloyd Garrison,

Resolved, That in the name and on behalf of more than two millions of helpless, crushed, and guiltless slaves in this, to them, *land of religious despotism* and *home of republican injustice*, we honor and bless the philanthropists and Christians of Great Britain, for the noble example they have set in the emancipation of eight hundred thousand slaves in the British colonies, and for their untiring, faithful, and Christian efforts to abolish slavery and the slave trade throughout the world.

Resolved, That the safe arrival in England of our indefatigable and eloquent coadjutor, GEORGE THOMPSON, with his family, is matter of joyful thanksgiving to the God of the oppressed; that his generous and enthusiastic reception by the people of Great Britain is another proof of their growing regard for the cause of peaceful, righteous, and impartial liberty throughout the world, as well as a triumphant vindication of his character from the aspersions cast upon it by his enemies in this country.

On motion of Rev. Theo. S. Wright,

Resolved, That it be recommended to each of the Auxiliary Societies to appoint a standing committee on introducing our colored brethren to the useful arts, with instructions to ascertain the number of colored persons in their several districts, who are desirous of learning the useful arts, and especially those who are desirous of becoming regular apprentices to such mechanics as are willing to teach them trades, and to treat them as they do their other apprentices.

Resolved, That the Auxiliary Societies be requested to report the statistics relating to those colored persons in their several localities, who are desirous of being introduced into the knowledge of the useful arts.

On motion of Thomas Shipley,

Resolved, That it is the duty of every auxiliary of this society to use strenuous efforts, in their respective vicinities, for the improvement of their colored fellow citizens in literature, morals, and religion.

On motion, William Goodell, Edward Weed, H. B. Stanton, and Rev. Theodore S. Wright were appointed a committee to report resolutions on the subject of the education of the people of color. They reported the following, which were unanimously adopted.

Resolved, That it be recommended to the Executive Committee of this Society, to employ an agent to superintend and urge forward the great work of elevating the pecuniary, social, intellectual, and moral condition of the free people of color.

Resolved, That it be recommended to the Executive Committee of this Society to employ an agent or agents to investigate the actual condition of the colored people in the free States, with a view to ascertain and publish the facts in respect to their pecuniary, social, intellectual, moral and religious condition.

On motion of Rev. George Bourne,

Resolved, That all claims which slaveholders make to human beings as property, are unnatural and impious—a mischief 'framed by law;'—that, in the language of the apostle, it is the duty of the slave, if he may be free, 'to use it rather,' and that the law of God—'Thou shalt not deliver unto his master, the servant that is escaped from his master unto thee'—absolutely forbids every attempt, under any pretext, to seize and restore the fugitive to his oppressor.

On motion of Thomas Shipley,

Resolved, That, whatever differences of opinion may exist, in respect to the degree and kind of obligation resting on the people of the free States, under the Federal Constitution, to return fugitive slaves to their masters, there is *no* obligation imposed on the sovereign States to surrender, nor should they surrender, the liberties of citizens, without trial by jury.

On motion of James Appleton,

Resolved, That the common practice of apologizing for slavery, by comparing the free laborers of the North with the slaves of the South, is fitted to create in the public mind, low and depreciating views of the value of civil liberty; and tends directly to reduce the one to the condition of the other, at the same time that it asserts what is as untrue in fact, as it is detestable in principle and pernicious in tendency.

On motion of Rev. Charles Stuart,

Resolved, That we bless God for the co-operation of such of our beloved sisters as have united their labors with ours, and that we earnestly invite every lady in the land, who feels for female honor, for human happiness and virtue, and for God's holy law, to join their prayers and efforts with ours in behalf of the 'suffering and the dumb.'

Resolved, That the general conduct of our colored brethren, both enslaved and free, continues to command our cordial approbation, and enhances the duty and the privilege of pleading their cause.

On motion of S. S. Jocelyn,

Resolved, That the prejudice peculiar to our country, which subjects our colored brethren to a degrading distinction in our worshipping assemblies, which withholds from them that kind and courteous treatment to which, as well as other citizens, they have a right, at public houses, on board steamboats, in stages, and places of public concourse, is the very spirit of slavery, and is nefarious and wicked, and should be practically reprobated and discountenanced.

On motion of Orson S. Murray,

Resolved, That every successive movement of the Colonization Society confirms our formerly expressed views, and increases our disapprobation of the whole scheme, as tending to perpetuate slavery; to crush the free colored population, both of the North and of the South; to afford facilities for the African slave trade; and to reproach Christianity in the eyes of the native Africans.

On motion of William Goodell,

Resolved, That, while the signs of the times, in respect to the great interests of civil and religious freedom in our own age and nation, are such as impel us to watch with solicitude, to labor with patience, and to hope with trembling; yet the promises and predictions of God, in the Scriptures, afford a sufficient warrant for the confident assurance, that those great interests shall ere long be secured in the universal prevalence of practical righteousness and holy liberty throughout the earth.

Resolved, That the increased attention to the Monthly Concert of prayer for the people of color, bond and free, in our land, is cause of devout gratitude to God, and that the friends of oppressed humanity be requested to continue their observance of that season—'Remembering them who are in bonds as bound with them.'

On motion of Henry B. Stanton,

Resolved, That under God we rely mainly for the removal of slavery, upon the faithful testimony of the Christian Church against it,—that we earnestly invite Christian and individual churches of all denominations, immediately to petition their ecclesiastical judicatories and associations, to pass resolutions condemning slavery as a sin, and to take such other measures as are proper to effect its speedy removal: and that we recommend to the Ex. Committee of this society to address the Christians of the nation, and urge them to commence this work without delay.

Resolved, That it be recommended to the Executive Committee of this Society to emply two or more agents to visit the British West India Islands and Hayti, during the present year, to collect and transmit to this country facts from official and unofficial sources relative to the condition of the colored population of those Islands, and the effect of the various systems of emancipation there adopted, upon the physical, agricultural, commercial, educational, and religious prosperity of the inhabitants.

On motion of Rev. H. C. Wright,

Resolved, That the admission of the Territory of Arkansas into the Union as a slaveholding State, would justly subject this nation afresh to the reprobation and abhorrence of mankind, and to the frowns and judgments of Almighty God; that it ought to be resisted by all who have hearts of flesh, as an impious attempt to extend and increase the horrors and heathenism of slavery and the slave trade; that we invoke Congress, by every consideration of humanity and justice, to refuse its admission on such terms: and that we call upon the people of the land to sustain them in the discharge of this high duty to God, their country, and the world.

Resolved, That the unjust and unconstitutional imprisonment of Dr. Crandall in the District of Columbia, and the hardships to which he has been subjected, on the charge of being an abolitionist, demand of the whole people, without distinction of sect or party, a strong expression of reprobation, and a requisition that reparation be made him for the wrongs he has suffered.

On motion of Gerrit Smith, Esq.

Resolved, That it is evident that the present struggle in Texas against the government of Mexico, is mainly for the extension and perpetuity of slavery, and therefore deserves the strongest reprobation of the friends of liberty and humanity; and that we fully believe that the independence of Texas, or its acquisition by our government under these circumstances, would be mournfully disastrous to the cause of the colored race, of liberty, republicanism, and Christianity.

On motion,

Resolved, That we heartily approve of the Anti-Slavery Almanac, published by Nath. Southard of Boston, and earnestly recommend to all the friends of emancipation, to take immediate and efficient measures for its extensive circulation.

Resolved, That the Executive Committee be instructed to publish 5000 copies of the Annual Report.

N. Y. FEMALE ANTI-SLAVERY SOCIETY.

The following resolutions have been adopted, and forwarded to GEORGE THOMPSON, by the ladies of this Society:

Resolved, That we honor the devotion and disinterestedness, and admire the eloquence, courage, and consistency of George Thompson in his labors in the Anti-Slavery cause in this country—that we thank the God of the oppressed for the eminent services he has rendered to the cause of humanity amongst us, and that we feel ourselves under especial obligation for his powerful assistance at the formation of this society.

Resolved, That we regard with shame and grief the 'Measures' pursued by the enemies of liberty toward Mr. Thompson, and that we consider them as the evidence and the direct result of his faithfulness and irresistible power in the advocacy of the cause of the poor slave.

Resolved, That while we deeply lament the loss of Mr. Thompson's labors in our cause, yet in consequence of the violent hostility and cruel treatment of the enemies of liberty in this country toward him, we believe that his taking the field in England against the apprenticeship system will, at present, do more for the slave in America, than any direct course of action here could accomplish.

Resolved, That the corresponding secretary be directed to address a letter, and to communicate these resolutions to Mr. Thompson.

A melancholy accident occurred at East Cambridge, on Sunday, 22d ult. As the Rev. Mr. Jacobs, a Baptist minister, and his lady, were on their way to church in a chaise, the horse took fright and ran down the street to the Universalist Meeting House, where the chaise was overturned, and the horse detached from it. Mr. J. was thrown out, and his head striking the wall of the church, the skull was fractured in a most shocking manner; he was taken into a neighboring house, where he expired in a few moments. He was about 50 years old, and greatly beloved by his friends and congregation. Mrs. J. was so severely injured that her life is despaired of.

The Baptist Meeting House in Worcester was destroyed by fire on Friday night last, supposed to have been the work of an incendiary.

A 'finner whale,' thirty-five feet long, made his appearance in Portsmouth, (N. H.) harbor last week, and was captured by the crews of two boats from the whale ship Pocahontas, lying in that port. It is thought he will make 12 or 15 barrels of oil.